



CHARLES HUGH EVERARD.



LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

880
C82p

PEREGRINUS PROTEUS.

Ταῦτα μὲν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς προδιωρισάμεθα, ἡρῆμένοι τὴν τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων διάνοιαν ἐκ τοῦ σχεδὸν τὴν τῆς ὑποθέσεως πρόθεσιν εὐσύνοπτον ἔχειν· ἵνα δὲ μὴ τινι ἐξῇ λυμαίνεσθαι τῷ συγγράμματι· εἰώθασι γὰρ οἱ πλείστοι τὰς ἀλλοτρίας πραγματείας διασκευάζειν πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν· τὰς μὲν τῶν τόμων ἀκροστιχίδας τῷ ἐμῷ προσηφαλισάμην ὀνόματί τε καὶ ἐπωνύμῳ, διὰ πάντων χρόνον ἐτῶν συγκλειόντων. Καὶ τοίνυν αἰτῶ, ἃ μὲν καλῶς ὑπηγόρευται παρ' ὅλην τὴν συγγραφὴν, μὴ μετεχέτω φθόνου, ὃς τοῖς καλοῖς πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιφύεσθαι εἴωθεν· ἃ δὲ ἀγνοῆσαι συνέπεσε, παρὰ τῶν οἷς λόγου δύναμις καὶ πείρας, διορθωτέον κ.τ.λ. Niceph. (*Proem.*) *H. E.* i. 1, p. 43.

Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἀκριβῶς προδιωρισάμεθα, βουλόμενοι τοὺς μὲν ἀναγινώσκοντας εἰς ἔννοιαν ἀγαγεῖν τῆς ὅλης προθέσεως· τοὺς δὲ διασκευάζειν εἰωθότας τὰς βίβλους ἀποτρέψαι τοῦ λυμαίνεσθαι τὰς ἀλλοτρίας πραγματείας. ἡμῖν δὲ παρ' ὅλην τὴν ἱστορίαν τὰ μὲν γραφέντα καλῶς, μὴ μετεχέτω φθόνου· τὰ δὲ ἀγνοηθέντα τυγχανέτω διορθώσεως ὑπὸ τῶν δυνατωτέρων. Diod. Sic. (*Proem.*) i. 5, p. 9.

PEREGRINUS PROTEUS:

An Investigation

INTO

CERTAIN RELATIONS SUBSISTING BETWEEN

DE MORTE PEREGRINI

THE TWO EPISTLES OF CLEMENT TO THE CORINTHIANS

THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

THE BIBLIOTHECA OF PHOTIUS

AND OTHER WRITINGS

BY J. M. COTTERILL

EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1879

(ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.)

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, . . . ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, . . . SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

PREFACE.

THE circumstances attending the publication of this volume are known to some persons. They can bear witness that the writer did not first of all invent the theory of a literary fraud perpetrated in the times of the revival of letters, and then seek for the facts by which to establish it. They know that the theory, as it is propounded in the following pages, has been gradually developed to meet the facts as they have come to light. They can testify that, from the coincidences which first of all came into the writer's hands, he sought not to destroy, but to establish the credit of more than one of the writings, the authenticity of which he is now obliged to deny. Thus much it is necessary to say, for to some persons it will seem strange that the completion of the inquiry into the *Epistle to Diognetus*, begun in the *Church Quarterly Review* in 1877, should still remain unpublished. The results of this inquiry would have been printed, in a complete form and in a separate volume, in the autumn of 1877 if, meanwhile, the writer had not become convinced of the spuriousness of the two *Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians*. It seemed unfair to attempt to deal with the question of the genuineness of *Diognetus* in silence as to his conviction that more important interests were at stake. An examination of Clement's *Epistles* was accordingly written, and a portion of it (now published as an appendix) placed in the printers' hands. Later on, the interpolations in Photius' *Bibliotheca*, the spuriousness of *De Morte Peregrini* and its connection with the *Bibliotheca* and every one of the suspected writings, became apparent. It then seemed to him that the subject could only be fairly treated by publishing a preliminary volume which should show the existence of a large number of singular coincidences imperatively demanding some

20 Jan 61 Nouis
 Gen Res Engl. 9 June 60 Barnes & Noble

explanation. The object of the present volume, therefore, is simply to point out certain circumstances which the writer believes can only be explained by the theory of a great literary fraud in the times of the revival of learning. It does not profess to make a complete study of any single writing, or to discuss beforehand objections and difficulties which may obviously be urged, but which will find their solution when once the fraud is regarded as an established fact. The volume is intended to furnish a ready starting-point and base of operations for such further examination of any of the suspected writings as may seem to be required. In the process of composition some deviation from the original plan has been necessitated by the abundance of the fresh evidence which has presented itself on every hand; and thus, in its present form, the book deals less with the *Epistle to Diognetus* and some other writings,—less even with *Peregrinus*,—and more with the *Epistles* of Clement, than was originally proposed.

No apology is needed for making known the facts contained in the following pages, nor ought any to be required for the exposition of what honestly seems to the writer to be the only possible explanation of those facts. It is much to be regretted that this explanation is so destructive as it is; but it may be doubted whether any other explanation would prove to be in the end less destructive. If the verbal coincidences supplied in the following pages—the way in which they have been found, their cumulative force, and the noteworthy character of some of them—may be legitimately set aside, the question must necessarily arise whether other arguments founded on verbal coincidences can hold their ground. If, however, no apology is needed for the work itself, still some apology should be made for the many imperfections in its execution. It will perhaps be allowed to the author to plead first the limited supply of books at his command, and secondly the difficulty of presenting his subject in an intelligible and readable form.

PORTOBELLO, *January* 1879.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

	PAGE
Some aspects of Revival of Learning, ...	1-5
Attempts at Literary Fraud, ...	6, 7

CHAPTER II.

HENRY STEPHENS.

His Life and Writings, ...	8-14
His Love of Parody, ...	14 sq.
<i>Homeri et Hesiodi Certamen</i> , ...	14, 15
<i>Parodiæ Morales</i> , ...	15-20

CHAPTER III.

COINCIDENCES.

§ 1. Sundry coincidences with Clement's <i>Ep.</i> i., ...	21-27
(1) § 1 with Eusebius, ...	21
(2) § 2 „ Plutarch, etc., ...	21 sq.
(3) § 36 (προσπάτης) with Sophocles, ...	22
(4) §§ 5, 36 with <i>Clem. Hom.</i> and Cyril of Jerusalem, ...	22 sq.
(5) § 12 with Diodorus, ...	23
(6) „ <i>Evang. Thom.</i> , ...	23
(7) § 19 with Basil and Epiphanius, ...	23 sq.
(8) §§ 19, 20, 61 with Basil, ...	24
(9) §§ 20, 37, 38 with Sophocles and Euripides in Stobæus, ...	24 sq.
§ 2. Coincidences with Clement's <i>Ep.</i> i. and other writings out of same pages of Philo, ...	27-29
§§ 58 (Plato), 44, 62 with Philo, ...	27
(1) Philo with <i>Peregrinus</i> , ...	28
(2) „ Philostratus and Cod. 244, ...	28
(3) „ Cod. 244, ...	28
(4) „ <i>Evangelium Thomæ</i> , ...	28
(5) „ 3 <i>Maccabees</i> , ...	28

CHAPTER IV.

DE MORTE PEREGRINI.

	PAGE
§ 1. Paraphrase, ...	30-34
§ 2. <i>Peregrinus</i> and Bp. Pearson and Ignatius, ...	34 sq.
§ 3. „ and Eusebius, Tertullian, Aulus Gellius, Philo- stratus, Athenagoras, ...	36-38

CHAPTER V.

EVANGELIUM THOMÆ.

§ 1. Jestng use of Prov. xxx. 4 and of <i>Ecclesiastes</i> , ...	42 sq.
§ 2. <i>Evang. Thom.</i> and <i>Peregrin.</i> 9 (quoted), ...	45
<i>Peregrin.</i> 9 indebted to Aristophanes, ...	45 sq.
<i>Peregrin.</i> §§ 10, 11 quoted, ...	47 sq.
προστάτης, <i>Peregrinus</i> , Cyril of Jerusalem, Clement, and Epiphanius, ...	48 sq.
μονώτατος, Lycurg. c. <i>Leocr.</i> , and <i>Peregrinus</i> , ...	48
„ Cod. 279, and <i>Peregrinus</i> , ...	50 sq.
Cod. 279, Aristophanes, and Cyr. Jer., ...	52 sq.
<i>Peregrinus</i> and Cod. 279 spurious, ...	56
<i>Ep.</i> i. 43 with Cod. 279, Cyr. Jer., <i>Peregrinus</i> , Cod. 244, and Epiphanius, ...	56-60
§ 3. <i>Evang. Thom.</i> and lines of Aristophanes used in <i>Peregrinus</i> , ...	60-67
<i>Evang. Thom.</i> A. 13, B. 11, quoted, ...	63
ἑναλλάξ and ἑναλλάκτως, ...	64 sq.
<i>Evang. Thom.</i> and Cod. 250, ...	67 sq.
καμάρα, Cod. 250, <i>Evang. Thom.</i> , Isa. xl., Eusebius, and Clement, ...	68-73
<i>Ep.</i> ii. 11 quoted, ...	72
ἑναλλάξ, Clement, and Diodorus, ...	73-75
§ 4. <i>De Prænotione ad Epigenem liber</i> , ...	75-92
Reasons for examining this Treatise, <i>Ep.</i> i. 65 quoted, ...	75-79
ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, passage quoted, ...	79 sq.
<i>De Prænot.</i> , <i>Peregrinus</i> , S. Paul's <i>Epistles</i> , <i>Acts</i> , Cod. 279, ...	80-84
“The keys,” <i>De Prænot.</i> , <i>Ep.</i> i. 43, ...	84 sq.
ἑναλλάξ, <i>De Prænot.</i> , <i>Ep.</i> i. 12, Cyr. Jer., <i>Peregrinus</i> , <i>Ep.</i> i. 43, ...	85 sq.
<i>De Prænot.</i> , Diodorus, and Cod. 244, ...	87-90
<i>De Prænot.</i> and Philo, ...	90-92
§ 5. Cod. 250, ...	90-107
Examined with Diodorus, ...	93-99
Sundry Excerpts considered, ...	99-107
1. Elephant-hunters, <i>Evang. Thom.</i> ἑναλλάξ, ...	99 sq.
2. Writer betrays himself by use of Strabo, ...	101
3. Locust-eaters, Clement and μελανώτερος, use of Plutarch, ...	101 sq.
4, 5. Use of Ælian, ...	102 sq.
6. καμάρα, ...	104-107

	PAGE
§ 6. <i>μελανώτερος</i> and Clement's apocryphal quotation, . . .	107-146
<i>Ep. i.</i> §§ 7, 8 quoted, ...	108 sq.
1. Clement's method of composition and use of Holy Scripture, . . .	109-113
<i>Ep. i.</i> 27 quoted, ...	111
2. §§ 7, 8, 27, and other writings, ...	113 sq.
(1) <i>Ep. i.</i> 27 with Clem. Alex., Eusebius, Dionysius, . . .	
<i>Peregrinus</i> , Hippolytus, <i>Diognetus</i> , . . .	113-116
<i>Diognet.</i> 11 quoted, ...	114 sq.
<i>Epistola ad Theophilum</i> and later developments, . . .	116 sq.
<i>Ep. i.</i> 27 (also §§ 7, 8, 40, 41, 42, 43, etc.) with . . .	
<i>Theophilus</i> , ...	117-122
<i>Ep. i.</i> 16 with <i>Theophilus</i> , Jerome, Eusebius, . . .	122 sq.
<i>Ep. i.</i> 29 quoted, ...	128 sq.
(2) <i>Ep. i.</i> §§ 7, 8, ...	129 sq.
,, with Basil (Ps. cxxxii., cxv.) and . . .	
Chrysostom, ...	130 sq.
<i>Ep. i.</i> §§ 7, 8 with Irenæus and <i>Diognetus</i> , . . .	131 sq.
<i>Diognet.</i> 7 quoted, ...	132
<i>Ep. i.</i> §§ 7, 8 with <i>Wisdom</i> , Hippolytus, Clem. . .	
Alex., and <i>Diognetus</i> , ...	132-134
<i>Ep. i.</i> §§ 7, 8 (apocryphal quotation) with <i>Sacra</i> . . .	
<i>Parallela</i> , Clem. Alex., and Tertullian, . . .	134-139
3. <i>Sacra Parallela</i> and its excerpts from an unknown Eusebius, . . .	139-146
<i>ἁγιοπρεπής</i> , Clement, Polycarp, Eusebius, . . .	141
§ 7. Prefaces to <i>Sacra Parallela</i> , ...	146-167
Lequien's remarks, ...	147
1. Prefaces, <i>Ep. ii.</i> 19 (quoted), and <i>Ecclesiastes</i> , . . .	147-150
2. ,, Diodorus, Clement, Didymus, <i>Theophilus</i> , <i>Pere-</i> . . .	
<i>grinus</i> , ...	150-154
3. Prefaces, Diodorus, <i>Peregrinus</i> , Clement, and <i>Diognetus</i> , . . .	154-158
4. ,, and Philo, ...	158 sq.
5. ,, not written by John of Damascus, ...	159 sq.
6. ,, and <i>Sermo de legendis libris Gentilium</i> , . . .	160-167
,, <i>De Legend.</i> , Diodorus, Cod. 244, pseudo-Galen, . . .	
<i>Peregrinus</i> , ...	160-162
<i>De Legend.</i> with Xenophon, ...	163 sq.
,, with Cyril of Alexandria, Stobæus, and Philo, . . .	164-167
§ 8. <i>Vis enim a Deo non fit, sed bona sententia adest illi semper</i> , . . .	
<i>Diognetus</i> , Clement, <i>Sacra Par.</i> , Stobæus, Xenophon, . . .	167-169
§ 9. 1. <i>Ep. i.</i> 14, Xenophon, Cedrenus, and Stobæus, . . .	169 sq.
2. Topics in column of Cedrenus taken up in <i>Peregrinus</i> , <i>De</i> . . .	
<i>leg. libr. Gent.</i> etc., ...	171 sq.
<i>Peregrin.</i> §§ 24, 25, and 3 Macc. iv. 19-21, quoted, . . .	172 sq.
Cedrenus, <i>Peregrinus</i> , pseudo-Basil, and <i>Oratio</i> , . . .	174 sq.
<i>Oratio</i> examined, ...	175-200
,, and Eusebius, ...	176-179
<i>Orat.</i> 5 quoted, ...	177
<i>Peregrinus</i> and Eusebius, ...	179
<i>Orat.</i> 3 quoted, ...	180
,, and H. Stephens, ...	180 sq.
,, and Cod. 190, ...	182 sq.

	PAGE
<i>Orat.</i> 3 and Diodorus, ...	187 sq.
Diodorus, <i>Peregrinus</i> , Philostratus, and Cod. 244, ...	188 sq.
H. Stephens, <i>Oratio</i> , <i>Clem. Hom.</i> , Euripides, ...	191 sq.
" " " " and <i>Ep.</i> i. 55, ...	193 sq.
Corrupt passage in <i>Orat.</i> 2, ...	196 sq.
" " <i>Ep.</i> i. 6, ...	198
Connection with <i>Theophilus</i> , ...	198 sq.
10. Return to column of Cedrenus, ...	200
1. Cedrenus and <i>De leg. libr. Gent.</i> , Xenophon, Eustathius, <i>Oratio</i> , and Aristophanes, ...	200 sq.
2. Hippolytus' <i>Refutatio</i> , <i>Ep.</i> i. §§ 44, 34; ii. §§ 11, 14, and 1 Cor. ii. 9, ...	203 sq.
3. Xenophon and Achilles Tatius, ...	207
Tatius and Cods. 244, 250, Cedrenus, <i>Oratio</i> , Herodotus, pseudo-Basil, and <i>Theophilus</i> , ...	207 sq.
Illustrations out of Tatius of matters previously observed,	211-247
(1) Tatius with <i>Peregrinus</i> and Clement, ...	211
(2) Tatius with <i>Oratio</i> , pseudo-Basil, <i>Peregrinus</i> , <i>Theo-</i> <i>philus</i> , Clement, ...	211 sq.
(3) Tatius with Cedrenus, Hippolytus, Aristophanes, Cod. 279, <i>Theophilus</i> , Eusebius, Diodorus, and <i>Oratio</i> , ...	212
(4) Tatius with Euripides (Iphigenia), <i>Clem. Hom.</i> , <i>Oratio</i> , <i>Peregrinus</i> , Cod. 244, ...	212 sq.
Tatius' parody of Rev. v., <i>Ep.</i> ii. 19, and <i>Peregrinus</i> , ...	214 sq.
(5) Tatius with Cod. 244, and pages of Diodorus used by Clement, etc., ...	215 sq.
(6) Tatius and "the keys," pseudo-Galen, Clement, <i>Oratio</i> , pseudo-Basil, Plutarch, Cod. 244, ...	216 sq.
(7) Tatius and the Elephant, Cod. 250, <i>Evang. Thom.</i> , <i>Theophilus</i> , Basil, Cod. 244, Clement, Apollodorus, Plutarch, Ælian, Homer, <i>Peregrinus</i> , ...	217-222
<i>Ep.</i> i. §§ 46, 47 quoted, ...	221
" indebted to Clem. Alex., ...	221 sq.
(8) " <i>Oratio</i> and Cod. 190, ...	222 sq.
(9) Tatius, <i>lib.</i> iv. 3 (Hippopotamus) quoted, ...	223
Use of Diodorus and Cod. 250, ...	223-225
Tatius, accounts of Calanus, <i>Peregrinus</i> , Ælian, Strabo, 3 <i>Maccabees</i> , Arrian, ...	225-229
3 <i>Macc.</i> and Tatius, <i>Peregrinus</i> , Strabo, Diodorus, Cod. 250, <i>Ecclesiastes</i> , Greg. Thaum., <i>Evang. Thom.</i> , ...	229-231
Tatius and Ælian, ...	231 sq.
(10) Tatius, <i>lib.</i> vi. §§ 5, 13 quoted, ...	234, 235
§ 5 with Cod. 279, pseudo-Galen, and <i>Acts</i> , ...	234 sq.
§ 13 with Diodorus, Cod. 250, Tzetzes, pseudo-Galen, <i>Oratio</i> , Thucydides, Philo, ...	235-238
Jesting in Cod. 250 and <i>Oratio</i> , ...	236 sq.
(11) Tatius and Cod. 232 (Stephanus Gobarus), Hegesippus, and 1 Cor. ii. 9, Clement, ...	238-241
Cod. 232 and Tatius, <i>lib.</i> v. 11 quoted, ...	241
Connection with Clement in use of Jas. iv. 6, ...	242 sq.
Cod. 232 with Eusebius, Ignatius, Jerome, and Irenæus, Conclusion as to Tatius' love-story, ...	244-247 247

CHAPTER VI.

PHOTII BIBLIOTHECA.

	PAGE
Reason of Selection of this Work for further Examination, ...	248
§ 1. Cod. 126 quoted entire, ...	248 sq.
1. ἀπαρκαλίπτως and apocryphal quotations, ...	249
Connection with <i>Peregrinus</i> :—	
(1) § 24 ; (2) § 41, ...	250
(3) προστάτης, Cod. 126, <i>Peregrin.</i> 11, Aristophanes, and <i>Ep.</i> i. 61, ...	251
(4) προστάτης, Cod. 126, <i>Peregrin.</i> 11, Aristophanes, and <i>Ep.</i> i. 36, ...	252 sq.
2. The coincidences not accidental, ...	254-258
(1) "Scholia" on Arist. <i>Plut.</i> 21, 27, and <i>Ep.</i> i. §§ 19, 53 ; ii. §§ 10, 19, 20, ...	254 sq.
(2) <i>Lycurg. c. Leocr.</i> and <i>Ep.</i> ii. 20, ...	255
(3) <i>Evang. Thom.</i> A. §§ 7, 8, B. 6, and <i>Ep.</i> i. 36, ...	255 sq.
(4) <i>Theoph.</i> 18, <i>Evang. Thom.</i> , <i>Ep.</i> i. 36, <i>Plut.</i> ii. p. 695, and <i>Tatius</i> , v. 2, etc., ...	256-258
<i>Theophilus</i> , and interpolation in <i>Ep.</i> i. 35, ...	257
3. Cod. 126 and <i>De Spir. Sanct.</i> xxix., ...	259 sq.
(1) Author of Clement's Epistles made use of <i>De Spir.</i> <i>Sanct.</i> , ...	259-270
Clement's favourite Doxology, ...	260
<i>Ep.</i> i. 20, <i>De Spir. Sanct.</i> , and Philo, quoted, ...	260 sq.
,, and Clem. Alex., ...	262 sq.
,, and Diodorus, ...	263 sq.
<i>Ep.</i> i. 33 (quoted), Philo, and Diodorus, ...	265 sq.
Clement, <i>Theophilus</i> and Liturgies, ...	266 sq.
,, <i>Apost. Const.</i> , Philo, <i>Theophilus</i> , Dio- dorus, <i>Oratio</i> , Cod. 250, and pseudo-Galen, ...	268 sq.
(2) <i>De Spir. Sanct.</i> used (if not written) by author of Cod. 126, ...	270 sq.
(3) <i>De Spir. Sanct.</i> cc. xxix. xxx. belong to our "group of writings,"	271 sq.
<i>De Spir. Sanct.</i> , Cod. 250, Diodorus, Cod. 213, <i>Evang. Thom.</i> , Strabo, <i>Daniel</i> , Thucydides, Nicephorus, ...	271 sq.
Nicephorus and Diodorus, ...	277 sq.
Pseudo-Basil and Nicephorus, different names for same person, ...	279
§ 2. Cod. 244, ...	279-288
1. Excerpts on Hermaphrodites, ...	280
(1) <i>Evang. Thom.</i> , <i>Oratio</i> , Aristophanes, and Cod. 244, ...	280 sq.
(2) <i>Ælian</i> , pseudo-Eustathius, Clem. Alex., and Cod. 244, ...	281 sq.
2. Excerpts on death of Catulus, etc., quoted, ...	282 sq.
Connection with Plutarch, Cod. 250, Polybius, Zonaras, Cedrenus, Nicephorus, Appian, and Glycas, ...	283 sq.
Nicephorus the interpolator of the <i>Bibliotheca</i> , ...	285 sq.

	PAGE
Connection of Nicephorus' writings with our "group,"	288 sq.
(1) Nicephorus, <i>Sacra Parallela</i> , and Diodorus,	288 sq.
(2) „ Clement, and Diodorus,	289
(3) „ <i>De Spir. Sanct.</i> , Cod. 250, <i>Epist. Jer.</i> , <i>De Laud. Const.</i> , Clem. Alex., <i>Ep. i. 20, Apost.</i> <i>Const.</i> ,	289 sq.
(4) Nicephorus, <i>Ep. i. 20, De Laud. Const.</i> , Didymus, <i>De Spir. Sanct.</i> , <i>Oratio, Theophilus</i> , Tattius, <i>Apost. Const.</i> , Cod. 250, <i>Ep. i. 33</i> ,	290 sq.
Authorship of "group of writings" traced to times of revival of learning,	293

CHAPTER VII.

CONCLUSION.

§ 1. Coincidences,	294 sq.
§ 2. Documents, the authenticity of which is denied,	298 sq.
§ 3. Photius' <i>Bibliotheca</i> ,	299 sq.
§ 4. Clement's Epistles,	302 sq.
1. They say too little,	304 sq.
They say too much,	305
2. Sundry sets of coincidences,	305 sq.
3. Examination of some supposed witnesses to genuineness,	312 sq.
Epistles belong to "group of writings,"	314
§ 5. At what period these writings were composed,	315 sq.
§ 6. A forged ms. not an impossibility,	319 sq.

APPENDIX.

§ 1. Clement's Epistles and their mss.,	325 sq.
§ 2. Canon Lightfoot's analysis of the readings of the mss.,	326 sq.
§ 3. Inconsistencies in the mss.,	328 sq.
§ 4. Lack of "external testimony to the antiquity" of the mss.,	329 sq.
§ 5. Remarkable statement in <i>Ep. i.</i> unnoticed by antiquity,	330 sq.
§ 6. Unsatisfied references of antiquity,	332 sq.
Sibylline verses found in <i>Apost. Const.</i> , and used in <i>Peregrinus</i> , once stood in <i>Ep. i.</i> ,	333 sq.
A. Clement's Epistles and Diodorus,	339 sq.
<i>Ep. i. 12</i> quoted entire,	342
„ and <i>Evang. Thom.</i> ,	343 sq.
Clement used Diodorus in jest,	347
<i>Ep. i. 12</i> , Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Origen,	349 sq.
B. § 1. Apocryphal quotation in <i>Ep. ii. 4</i> ,	351 sq.
Cod. 126,	351, 354
<i>Evang. Thom.</i> ,	356 sq.
§ 2. Clement's Epistles, <i>Diognetus</i> , Hippolytus, and Lucian,	357 sq.

DOCUMENTS

THE AUTHENTICITY OF WHICH IS DENIED.

1. DE MORTE PEREGRINI, ASCRIBED TO LUCIAN.

	PAGE		PAGE
§ 1,	179	§ 25,	172 sq., 226, 228, 242
6,	47	26,	215
8,	170, 227	27,	226
9,	45, 49, 51, 67, 202, 253	29,	333
10,	47, 49, 155, 188	32,	75, 219, 225 sq.
11,	47, 49, 51, 55, 57, 58, 61, 86, 155, 250, 251, 254	33,	193, 213, 215, 219
12,	86, 88, 216, 233	36,	44, 46, 66, 231 sq.
13,	49, 58	37,	44, 221
15,	47	38,	283
16,	114, 171	39,	173, 232, 250
19,	37, 80, 114, 155, 161, 188 sq.	40,	47, 171
21,	188, 226	41,	28, 34 sq., 219 sq., 250
22,	189	42,	124, 170, 211
23,	37, 283	44,	90, 179, 256
24,	24, 172 sq., 203, 211, 250	45,	258

2. EVANGELIUM THOMÆ.

A. 7,	61, 62, 70, 100, 212, 252, 255	A. 14,	343, 356 sq.
8,	255, 345	16,	43, 44
9,	23, 67, 253, 344	17,	28
10,	43, 62, 69, 217, 231, 345 sq.	B. 6,	255
11,	42, 75, 345	8,	345
12,	43	10,	42, 345 sq.
13,	42, 61, 63 sq., 99, 107, 183, 216, 343	11,	63 sq., 99, 107, 183, 231, 345 sq., 356 sq.

3. EPISTOLÆ DUÆ AD CORINTHIOS, ASCRIBED TO CLEMENT.

EP. I.

§ 1,	21, 209, 341	§ 7,	108 sq., 113 sq., 130 sq., 212, 344
2,	21, 22, 114, 232	8,	101, 108 sq., 113 sq., 130 sq., 141, 167, 201, 212, 249
3,	59	9,	266, 359
4,	346	10,	359
5,	22, 49, 129, 194, 198 sq., 331, 339	11,	74, 343, 344
6,	90, 111, 198, 340		

	PAGE		PAGE
§ 12,	23, 73 sq., 84, 86, 88, 216, 290, 342 sq.	§ 40,	. . . 118, 144, 148
13,	. . . 141, 359	41,	. . . 119, 140, 144, 340
14,	. . . 123, 170, 180	42,	. . . 119
16,	. . . 121, 122 sq., 199	43,	. 56 sq., 73 sq., 84, 87, 119 sq., 144
19,	23, 24, 110, 131, 254, 289, 341	44,	. . . 27, 87, 205
20,	. 24, 114, 121 sq., 130, 211, 260, 261 sq., 265-271, 290, 292, 345	46,	. . . 130, 221, 224, 341
21,	. . . 110, 151, 170, 346	47,	. . . 221, 340
23,	. . . 347	48,	. . . 267
25,	. . . 226, 332 sq.	49,	. . . 341, 358
26,	. . . 335	50,	. . . 358
27,	. . . 111, 113 sq., 335	51,	. . . 344
28,	. . . 71, 125, 335, 356	53,	. . . 254, 264
29,	. . . 128 sq.	54,	. . . 151, 194
30,	. . . 243	55,	. . . 111, 193, 198 sq.
33,	. 129, 265 sq., 269, 292	56,	. . . 198
34,	. 69 sq., 110, 205, 239 sq., 246, 266	57,	. . . 27, 120
35,	. 70, 240, 242, 243, 257	58,	. . . 27, 259, 345
36,	22, 61, 120, 168, 243, 252 sq., 254, 255 sq.	59,	114, 153 sq., 158, 203, 267, 341
37,	. . . 25, 168, 221	60,	. . . 112
38,	. . . 25	61,	24, 110, 132 sq., 251, 254, 260
		62,	. . . 27, 141, 337
		63,	. . . 262
		64,	. . . 66
		65,	. . . 78, 79, 84

EP. II.

§ 1,	. . . 122, 124, 148, 149	§ 11,	. 72, 117, 126, 148, 205 sq., 239, 347
2,	. . . 353	12,	. . . 206, 208, 240, 352
3,	. . . 353	14,	. 205, 239, 240, 345, 358
4,	. . . 42, 69, 249, 351 sq.	15,	. . . 22, 206
5,	. . . 355	17,	. . . 357
6,	. . . 190	19,	. 68, 146, 148 sq., 205, 215, 218, 220, 255
7,	. . . 186, 212	20,	. . . 114, 254, 255
9,	. . . 218		
10,	. . . 255		

4. PHOTII BIBLIOTHECA.

Cod. 126,	23, 36, 248 sq., 351 sq.	230, 235, 236, 251, 256,
232,	. . . 239 sq.	262 sq., 269, 271, 272,
244,	28, 58, 61, 89, 90, 92, 131, 148, 151, 161, 184, 190, 205, 207, 213, 215, 217 sq., 219, 279 sq., 282 sq.	273 sq., 274, 275, 283, 288, 289, 290, 292.
250,	62, 67 sq., 92 sq., 158, 207, 217, 219 sq., 225, 228, 229,	Cod. 279, 50, 51, 53, 54, 58, 81, 82, 85, 151, 183, 212, 233, 234, 249, 250.

5. DE PRÆNOTIONE AD EPIGENEM LIBER, ASCRIBED TO GALEN.

Pp. 75 sq., 155, 161, 189, 216, 218, 234, 236 sq., 238, 263, 269, 291.

6. DE LEGENDIS LIBRIS GENTILIUM, ASCRIBED TO BASIL.

Pp. 155, 160 sq., 171, 172, 174, 175, 200, 202, 205, 208, 211, 217.

7. DE SPIRITU SANCTO, CC. XXIX., XXX., ASCRIBED TO BASIL.

Pp. 259 sq., 271 sq., 273 sq., 275 sq., 276, 289, 291, 345.

8. EPISTOLA AD DIOGNETUM, ASCRIBED TO JUSTIN MARTYR.

	PAGE		PAGE
§ 1,	134	§ 8,	185
3,	114, 171	9,	18, 133, 158
4,	131	10,	127, 178
5,	106, 115, 168	11,	114 sq., 121, 129
7,	110, 131, 132 sq., 167 sq., 178, 190	12,	115

9. ORATIO AD GRÆCOS, ASCRIBED TO JUSTIN MARTYR.

§ 1,	176, 191 sq., 211, 213, 291, 357	§ 4,	174, 186, 216
2,	175, 185, 187, 197, 212, 291	5,	174, 177 sq., 222, 241, 291
3,	50, 175, 179, 180 sq., 202, 222, 237, 263, 269, 346		

10. EPISTOLA AD THEOPHILUM, A SUPPOSED SYNODICAL LETTER.

§ 1,	129	§ 18,	208, 220, 251, 256 sq., 258, 269, 291
2,	125	24,	198, 210
3,	122, 126, 129, 266, 336	27,	199
4,	122	28,	199
5,	122 sq., 218	29,	267, 278, 291
6,	121, 136, 141	30,	118 sq., 124, 141, 153, 276, 278
7,	121, 129, 145, 150, 212	31,	117, 336
15,	255		
16,	203, 212, 257		

11. SACRA PARALLELA, ASCRIBED TO JOHN OF DAMASCUS.

Præfationes, 146 sq., 187, 188, 201, 205, 208, 288 sq.

12. CLITOPHONTIS ET LEUCIPPES AMORES, ASCRIBED TO ACHILLES TATIUS.

<i>Lib.</i> i. 3,	207, 220	<i>Lib.</i> ii. 8,	212
4,	207, 217, 218, 219	18,	211
5,	209	19,	216
6,	209	24,	213, 216
7,	209, 212	34,	212
9,	210	iii. 7,	211
12,	210 sq., 292	12,	213
13,	210, 230	13,	215, 224

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Lib.</i> iii. 14, ...	286	<i>Lib.</i> v. 13, ...	242
15, ...	213, 228	14, ...	235
16, ...	214	16, ...	231
22, ...	213	17, ...	231
25, ...	215, 220, 226	21, ...	242
iv. 1, ...	214 sq.	24, ...	231
2, ...	222 sq.	25, ...	212
3, ...	223 sq., 227, 273, 281	27, ...	271
4, ...	217 sq., 225, 269	vi. 1, ...	211
7, ...	212	2, ...	213
9, ...	218	4, ...	237
12, ...	211	5, ...	234 sq.
15, ...	218	11, ...	231
16, ...	231	12, ...	237 sq.
17, ...	231	13, ...	235 sq., 263
24, ...	231	14, ...	233
v. 1, ...	258	19, ...	216, 292
2, ...	258	vii. 5, ...	218, 227, 242 sq.
3, ...	258	6, ...	213
5, ...	231	9, ...	212
7, ...	283	viii. 6, ...	221, 224, 232
9, ...	230	15, ...	238
11, ...	241	17, ...	232
12, ...	241		

13. MACCABÆORUM III.

Chap. iv., ...	173, 227 sq., 229, 339	Chap. vi., ...	173 sq.
v., ...	231, 342	vii., ...	29, 174

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

- P. 16, l. 6, for *Sat.* i. 1 read *Sat.* ii.
P. 46, l. 23, ,, *καὶ μοι* ,, *καί μοι*.
P. 47, l. 17, ,, *τὶ* ,, *τε*.
P. 63, l. 15, ,, *ἔχοντες* ,, *ἔχοντος*.
P. 64, l. 28, for *ἱναλλάκτον μὴ ἔχοντες* read *ἱναλλάκτου μὴ ἔχοντος*.
P. 75 n., l. 2, for vi. read vii.
,, l. 7, ,, *CORDEX* ,, *CODEX*.
P. 122, l. 30, after p. 111 insert *ἐκάλεισεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας καὶ ἠθέλησεν ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἶναι ἡμᾶς. Ep.* ii. 1.
P. 150, l. 38, for the hermaphrodite read Hermaphroditus.
P. 153, l. 8, do. do.
P. 189, l. 35, for *τὸν* read *τὸ*.
P. 194, l. 32, ,, *κῆρυξ* ,, *κήρυξ*.
P. 200, l. 15, before Achilles insert an.
P. 205, l. 21, for 33 read 34.
P. 219, l. 19, ,, *διξιόντι* ,, *διξιόντι*.
,, l. 28, ,, *μῆνη* ,, *μῆνη*.
P. 226, note, ,, 24 ,, 25.
P. 227, l. 4, ,, *αὐτὴν* ,, *αὐτήν*.
P. 228, l. 8, ,, suppose and explain read supposed and escape.
P. 228, l. 22, for *οἶκημα* read *οἶκημα*.
P. 232, l. 24, ,, *κόμη* ,, *κόμη*.
P. 252, l. 26, delete that.

PEREGRINUS PROTEUS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

A LONG and patient examination of a certain group of documents has forced upon us the conclusion that they are not what they profess to be. We have found these documents to be all of them composed apparently on nearly the same plan, all of them closely linked to one another among themselves, all of them connected together in certain writings which they used in common. We have found what seems to us an explanation of the plan on which they have been written in some of Henry Stephens' books. Further inquiry has shown us that these documents are the natural productions of the times to which, on examination, they appear to belong.

In placing the results of this examination before our readers, we have thought that it would be for their convenience to reverse, or nearly so, the process which we were ourselves obliged to adopt.

We did not, in the first instance, consider the circumstances attending the revival of learning in the 15th and 16th centuries, the temptations to and the facilities for fraud which then existed, or the attempts at fraud which were actually made. It may, however, be well that the attention of our readers should first of all be directed to these things.

We did not suggest to ourselves a method of literary composition out of Stephens' books, and then set ourselves to find something which might seem to be written upon that method. Still the consideration of what Stephens says will help greatly towards understanding the method on which we believe the documents to which we refer to have been composed.

The discovery that all of the documents with which we deal

meet together in Lucian's *De Morte Peregrini*, was almost our last. We have thought, however, that it might be well to put it in the forefront of our inquiry.

There is very much that is painful in the suspicious examination into the truth of documents supposed to be genuine. We take no pleasure in exposing the fraud. And if that portion of our evidence which we now bring forward should seem to make it less necessary to produce the enormous mass of evidence which we hold in reserve, we shall be much rejoiced.

For these reasons we have thought it desirable to begin, where we ourselves in fact left off, with some reflections upon the phenomena which a consideration of the times of the revival of learning reveals.

§ 1. It will hardly be denied that the circumstances attending the revival of learning in the 15th and 16th centuries offered great facilities to any person, who might be so disposed and had the necessary skill, for passing off his own writings as the work of an ancient author. Men started off in all directions in search of MSS., and returned laden with their spoils. Investigation into the histories of the MSS. so brought into the market or the library was not possible, and their discoverer's word had to be taken. MSS. were, at any rate in the 15th century, numerous. They were found in convents, in private houses, and in such unexpected quarters, that it was hardly possible for a MS. to make its appearance under circumstances so strange as to excite suspicion. When "codices" reached private hands, they might be dealt with as their owners pleased. When they found their way into the public libraries, then in course of formation, they were subjected to no sufficient supervision. There was little or nothing to prevent the interpolation of MSS., or the substitution of one MS. for another, or the depositing of a MS. to be found, conveniently or accidentally, at some future time. Far otherwise is it to-day in the better class of public libraries, where the surveillance exercised over the use of MSS. makes such frauds difficult, if not wholly impossible. This careful supervision, it must be remarked, is a witness to the widespread feeling—founded on a knowledge of human nature—that, if opportunities for fraud be afforded, men will be found here and there dishonest enough to avail themselves of them. When, then, the facilities for dishonest dealings with

MSS. were so great as they were in the times of the revival of learning, it may be very safely assumed that there were at least some attempts at such dishonesty.

Assuming then that some forgeries, few or many, were attempted at the time of which we speak, it becomes a question of great importance to consider what shape they would be likely to take.

If the great movement, which we call the revival of learning, had been set on foot within the bosom of the church by men eager for some alteration and amendment in her theology or discipline, we might fairly conjecture that writings forged under such circumstances would have a distinct polemical object in view. The "revival" had, however, no such origin. It was not, at the outset, a moral or theological, but an intellectual movement. It began at a time when the general moral standard was low, and at first did little or nothing to raise that standard. It required, but it did not receive, the direction and control of Christian principle. Its immediate effects were in many cases such as some churchmen feared or professed to fear. In not a few instances classical study broke down, or at any rate weakened, whatever Christian feeling the student previously possessed. Some persons became pagans or semi-pagans, infidels or semi-infidels; others wallowed in obscenity, and in their own writings outdid the ancient authors whom they imitated. Men strove to reproduce the past in the present, too often copying the vices of antiquity as being more easy of imitation and more congenial to the natural mind than the virtues. It was, however, with very many, the language of antiquity that was imitated and reproduced rather than either its vices or its virtues. The object of their ambition was, above all things, to attain to scholarship. They desired nothing more. Scholarship was not regarded by such men as a means whereby something better might be reached, but was itself the goal towards which they pressed.

Such was one aspect of the revival of learning in Italy in the 15th century. There was of course another and brighter side to the movement, which would have to be taken account of in writing its history. All we contend for is, that the dark side did actually exist, and that out of that dark side would come any attempts at literary frauds which might be made.

§ 2. Now it is easy to see that forgeries, if made at all at this time, would be the work of scholars rather than of polemical divines. Such forgeries would not be unnatural under the circumstances. They would express the desire their writer had to feel, in a practical way, the mastery he had attained over an ancient tongue. They would be intellectual exercises on which he would bring to bear all his learning and scholarship. The allusions they contained he would regard as sufficient finger-posts to his learning; the groupings of words, of which he only would know the history, would be the evidence to himself of his scholarship. The subject-matter of these writings would not suggest the learned allusions and scholarly selections of words and phrases, but would be itself so shaped as to embrace them. Such writings would have but little of definite aim in them. Their writer might choose to personate a heathen author, but he might also prefer a Christian one. The writings of the Fathers were read. They were studied, however, by many only as Greek books with allusions that had to be understood, with corrupt passages that had to be amended, and for the sake of the differences in the use of Greek words and idioms which were interesting to the linguist. A religious and Christian topic might thus be taken as the subject of the forgery. The writing would have, however, no distinct polemical object in view. It would be, as in the former case, an intellectual exercise, but now moving in a different literary sphere. The religious subject would be taken not because it was religious, but because the writer felt within himself that in that line he had some special proficiency. The subject might, however, be taken for the sake of the covert jest and veiled blasphemy of which such writing was capable. To be just, we must add that the writer, if so offending, might be unconscious of the blasphemy in his keen appreciation of his jest.

We do not think it possible to read, *e.g.*, Symond's *Renaissance in Italy* at all carefully without coming to the conclusion that forgeries of the 15th century, if attempted at all, would be, in the majority of cases, very much such as we endeavoured to describe. It is very needful to take note of this, for we are satisfied that some fictitious writings now supposed to be authentic ancient Christian documents have escaped detection

simply from the circumstance that no polemical object can be observed in them, a distinctly polemical purpose being assumed to be a necessary part of a fictitious Christian writing.

§ 3. When we pass over to France, Germany, and other quarters, we find the revival of learning marked in many respects by the same characteristics as in Italy. There was the same feverish thirst for ancient MSS., and the same determination to obtain them at any cost and by any means; the same desire for scholarship, and the same content with mere scholarship; the same love of ancient language, for language's sake rather than for the thoughts that language was intended to convey; the same ambition to be the first to discover, and the first to publish, a writing unknown before; the same temptation to literary fraud, and the same opportunity for accomplishing it. Some of the darker features of the movement in Italy were not so conspicuous, but dark side there was to the revival of learning everywhere. Out of that came the literary frauds, if any, which were attempted; and these would be for the most part such as we have before described.

§ 4. It was likely, as we have seen, that literary deceptions would be one of the forms in which an ill-regulated study of antiquity would show itself at the time of the revival of learning. As a matter of fact, attempts at such deception were not of unfrequent occurrence.

Greswell, in his *View of the Early Parisian Greek Press*, p. 316, speaks of the "fictum pro antiquo" as "an exercise commonly practised by early scholars." He describes the indignation of Scaliger at discovering that he had published some lines of Muretus as a fragment of an ancient poet (see Disraeli's *Cur. Lit. Masterly Imitators*). Something of the same kind as Muretus' fictitious fragment was the Latin "Satire" (by "an uncertain author"), which was published, as we shall see presently, by H. Stephens in 1577, and which deceived Barthius. This satire (which perhaps was not intended to deceive) was not a mere fragment, but a whole poem; and it suggests the probability that men would in those times be found ready to make bolder ventures in literary fraud, and to attempt to pass off considerable works as from the pen of an ancient writer. We might be sure that this would be the case even if we had no proof; but we have proof.

1. We might adduce Disraeli's *Cur. Lit. Literary Forgeries*, and his well-known account of the *Antiquitates Variæ* by Annii de Viterbo in the 15th century.

2. Fabricius (*Bibl.* v. 1, p. 88, Hamb. 1723) writes :

"Sub Athenagoræ Philosophi Atheniensis nomine prodiit etiam Gallice, veluti è Græco conversum opus, tributum in libros decem *de vero et perfecto amore*, sive de castis amoribus Theogenis et Charidis, Pherecydisque ac Melangeniæ. Interpres *Fumæus* (M. Fumée Seigneur de Genillé) qui codicem Græcum a Lamanæo Protonotario Cardinalis Armaniaci accepisse se testatur, versionemque suam Gallicam eidem Lamanæo 4 Octobr. 1569 inscripsit, non dubitat auctorem esse illum Athenagoram, cujus Apologia et liber de resurrectione exstat, quod etiam è stylo et colligendi ac disserendi ratione putat esse perspicuum."

No Greek original is in existence, and no one believes the treatise to be the work of Athenagoras. It is very commonly supposed to have been written by M. Fumée himself, or by one of his friends. There can be little doubt as to the deliberate attempt at fraud.

3. There are also a large number of letters in existence in a Latin dress which profess to have been written by Diodorus Siculus. No Greek original has ever been known. Internal evidence forbids a belief in the authorship of Diodorus. These letters are commonly ascribed to the times of the revival of learning.

4. Erasmus published in 1539 a Greek translation of Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus*, which professes to be by Sophronius, Jerome's friend. The printer certainly used a MS.; there is no proof that any other ever existed, and even that has not survived. Erasmus has been often accused of publishing a translation of his own under the name of Sophronius. We do not make this accusation. He speaks of an ancient MS. from which he took it, and he *may* have himself been deceived. The ancient MS., however, never appeared. The whole thing looks very like a fraud, not necessarily of Erasmus, but at any rate of some friend, who palmed off a MS. upon him which was afterwards found unable to bear the light. The translation has indeed been defended, but on the singularly weak ground "that many articles in Suidas are in the very words of this Greek version" (Smith's *Dict. Gr. Rom. Biogr.*, art. "Soph-

ronius"). It was as easy, we should suppose, for some pseudo-Sophronius to copy Suidas as for Suidas to copy the veritable Sophronius.

The weak point of these last three attempts at fraud was the lack of a sufficient Greek MS. Were there no cases in which this weak point was sufficiently provided against?

It is reasonable to conclude that there were. Certain it is that there are a great number of documents in existence which are not by the authors to whom the MSS. assign them. It would be a stretch of charity to suppose that all these cases of false ascription are due to the mistakes of ignorant transcribers. What is to hinder the conjecture that some of these are of very late date? It is a fact that some of these are supported in their false pretensions by writings which confessedly have been interpolated, *e.g.* pseudo-Athanasius' *De Virginitate*, which is referred to by Suidas. It is not an unfair inference that, at any rate in some instances, the support given to such false pretensions by an interpolated author is itself an interpolation. Men certainly had some object in tampering with ancient authors such as Suidas. It is certain that the *Sacra Parallela* of John of Damascus have been tampered with, but it is not at all certain that there are not still some undetected interpolations. Not a few writings are received as genuine, almost entirely on the strength of what is said concerning them in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius. This great work has been suspected, but it has never been proved to contain interpolations. It is, however, easy to understand what a powerful instrument for the support of forged documents it might have become—and indeed may now be—if it unhappily fell at any period in its history into unscrupulous hands.

It will be our business in due course to prove that literary frauds of some magnitude have been actually perpetrated, to give reasons for supposing these frauds to belong to the times of the revival of learning, and to show that we have been arguing throughout on a basis of actual fact.

CHAPTER II.

HENRY STEPHENS.

WE shall now proceed to explain the method on which, as we believe, some fictitious writings of the 15th or 16th centuries were composed.

§ 1. Among the most zealous and successful searchers after ancient MSS. in the 16th century was Henri Estienne, better known as H. Stephanus or Stephens. As the use of his books is necessary for our present purpose, it may be well at this point to give some account¹ of this learned but singular man.

He belonged to a family of celebrated printers. The first of these, Henri I., was born in 1460. He was disinherited for printing in 1482, and died in 1520. His second son was the distinguished Robert Stephens, so well known in connection with the sacred Scriptures. Robert Stephens died in 1559. His son, our Henry, was born in 1528. From his earliest years Henry was devoted to the study of Greek, with which, rather than Latin, by his own wish, he began his student's life. The best scholars of the day were his instructors. Though Greek was Henry's great delight, he seems to have applied himself to the study of almost everything that came in his way. It was, as he tells us himself, in his edition of *Aulus Gellius*, quite in his youth that he investigated the mysteries of astrology;² the extortionate demands, however, of the charlatan who instructed him and his own good sense together enabled him to shake off the infatuation. He devoted his attention also to Greek caligraphy, being the imitator of, and as some say, the pupil of Angelos Vergetius,³ "the king's

¹ From the *Ch. Quart.* April 1877, by permission. The following have been used:—Hallam, *Lit. of Europe*; Maittaire, *Vit. Steph.*; Greswell, *Hist. Early Paris. Press*; Didot, *Nouvelle Biogr. Universelle*, etc.

² *Vid. Ep.* iv. 5, note. Perhaps at this time he first became acquainted with Sextus Empir. : Stephens, in his books, often refers to, and sometimes quotes, his writings, though they were not published in Greek until after his day.

³ A MS. (*Cod. Par. Reg.* 1227) of Photius' *Biblioth.* is supposed to be in his handwriting.—*Phot.* vol. iii. p. 42, Migne.

writer in Greek," in which he became exceedingly expert. In the times of which we are speaking, though, through the revived state of learning, libraries were far more numerous and extensive than they had been a century previously, still very many MSS. were scattered about in monasteries and in private hands. The scholars of the day seem to have had each his own collection of MSS., which they borrowed the one from the other pretty freely.¹ It should be remembered also that the capture of Buda by the Turks in 1527 had dispersed abroad such of the contents of the magnificent library formed by M. Corvinus as had escaped destruction. The library contained not only ancient MSS. of great value, but also an immense number of 15th and 16th century transcripts of early writings.² These last were valuable to the scholar, by making him acquainted with ancient authors, but of little value to the editor and publisher without the originals from which they were copied, or some other ancient exemplars in their room.

It will be no matter for surprise that H. Stephens, at an early age, became ambitious of possessing such of these relics of antiquity as he could lay his hands upon. They were, in some sort, a passport into that literary circle into which he wished to penetrate. They were, moreover, the material which was to supply the printing-press which he proposed to establish at Paris. Accordingly, in 1547, we find that he started on a literary exploring expedition; and he spent three years and a half in making the acquaintance of the scholars, and in visiting the libraries of Rome, Florence, Naples, and other cities. In his preface to the *Ep. ad Diognet.*, Stephens speaks of the difficulties he found when in Italy in deciphering some of the ancient manuscripts. These expeditions were repeated at various times, and he not only became well acquainted with manuscripts of all dates, but also became possessed of a considerable number. Some of these he published in due course, others he used in preparing his editions of ancient authors. It is much to be regretted that Stephens was as careless

¹ *Vid. e.g.* P. Nannius' Pref. *Athan. Op.*

² M. Corvinus "availed himself of the dispersion of the libraries after the capture of Constantinople to purchase Greek MSS., and employed four transcribers at Florence, besides thirty at Buda, to enrich his collection."—Hall. *Lit. Eur.* i. p. 153; *vid.* Pattison. *Is. Casaub.* p. 38, Lond. 1875.

apparently in the preservation of these valuable documents as he was careful and diligent in the finding and acquiring them.

Returning to Paris at the close of 1551, he set up his printing-press in that city. That same year he put forth his first printed production—the first in a stream which was poured forth from one press or another so plentifully that, Hallam says, “in the year 1557 alone he published more editions of ancient authors than would have sufficed to make the reputation of another scholar” (*Lit. Eur.* i. p. 988).

In 1554 appeared the “editio princeps” of the *Odes of Anacreon*, beautifully printed, and for the preparation of which Stephens collated two manuscripts which had come into his possession, adding one ode, which he professed to have found on the cover of an old writing. “This book,” Greswell says,

“was variously received. The majority of the learned considered it a happy discovery, but some mistrusted it. Robertellus would not acknowledge it as legitimate; Fulvius Ursinus, in his edition of *Greek Lyric Poets*, denied a place to Anacreon. It were to be wished that the two manuscripts of which we have spoken had been preserved, but unfortunately H. Est., at the end of his days, having fallen into a sort of aberration of intellect,¹ suffered them to perish with many others which he communicated to no one—not even to his son-in-law, Casaubon” (vol. ii. p. 155).

In 1557 Stephens published an edition of Athenagoras (*Apol. and Resurr.*), manuscripts of which, as he told P. Nannius in 1551, had come into his hands. In 1563 he put forth *Rudimenta Fidei Christianæ: addita est ecclesiasticarum precum formula*, Gr. Lat. 12mo.² “This” (Greswell, p. 208) “is Calvin’s

¹ For the greater part of his life Stephens was subject to a certain mental malady, the like to which, he says, he had never heard or read of. While it was upon him he loathed his ordinary employment, and could not enter his library without putting his hand before his eyes. During one of these attacks he devoted himself to caligraphy, some specimens of which he afterwards engraved. On another occasion he completed a translation of the *Hypotyposes* of Sextus, which he had some while before thrown aside on account of its difficulty.—(Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* Pref. H. Steph. 1562. Gresw. ii. pp. 201, 206.)

² This translation is throughout largely indebted to the Greek Fathers and the Liturgies, and indeed to Greek literature generally. Thus the writer contrives (on p. 127), by the alteration of a participle into an infinitive, to incorporate a line by Agathon. This is very specially the case with the preface to the work, in which Stephens transcribes a passage from Xen. *Mem.* (ii. 1. 21), but without any acknowledgment. The thoughts and words of this preface can, in nearly all cases, be distinctly traced to sources more or less

Catechism, elegantly translated by Henry himself into Greek." The volume we spoke of above, as published in 1551, was the first edition of this *Catechism*, which was originally written in French. While turning it into Latin, Calvin made some alterations. Stephens took advantage of the opportunity which a fresh addition of this translation afforded to make some emendations.

He tells us, in a note at the end of the book, that Melanchthon had of his own accord sent him a letter of high approval of his earlier work (1551). Melanchthon, we may observe, was cousin and pupil of the eminent Johann Reuchlin, whose name appeared upon the back of the Strasburg MS. of the *Ep. ad Diognet.*, and who died in 1522. The title-page of this little book bears upon it the words, "Excudebat H. Steph. illustris viri Huldrici Fuggeri typogr."¹ Under this patronage Stephens' opportunities for the study of ancient MSS. were no doubt largely increased.

In 1572 Stephens published his great work, the *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguae*. His father, it would seem, had collected some materials for this work, and Sylburg, the great German scholar, assisted him, but Henry himself spent twelve years in its compilation. The value of the *Thesaurus* to Greek scholarship is too well known to need remark here. We may observe, however, that it was not prepared for the press exactly in the manner which we should have supposed. Stephens tells us in his preface² that it was written out for the press under great difficulties, as the printers wanted material. We shall marvel at the prodigious powers of mind and memory which could produce such a work under such circumstances; but we shall not be surprised to find that he omits many words and many

ancient. The Greek title *στοιχίσμους τῆς πίστεως* seems taken from Athan. *De Incarn. Verb.* p. 109, Colon. 1686.

¹ Stephens assumed this appellation in 1558. Fugger, a native of Augsburg, and born in 1528, "expended extraordinary sums in the purchase of good MSS. of ancient authors, and in procuring impressions of them."—Gresw. ii. p. 170.

² "Fallaris enim, lector, si hoc opus (exceptis paucis quibusdam ejus locis) aliter quam ad clepsydrā (ut loqui soleo) typographicā scriptum fuisse putas; id est, ut quemadmodum typographicæ operæ certo quotidie penso obnoxii sunt, ita et ipse certo certaque hora exhibendo scriptionis meæ penso obnoxius essem. Adde quod ne id quidem conficiendi pensi tempus, licet breve, liberum ab aliis occupationibus et negotiis erat, sed ita vario eorum genere et circa rem typographicā et circa rem familiarem districtum atque implicitum, ut unius inter-dum horæ spatio decies illa mihi scriptio intermittenda esset."—*Thes.* Pref. p. 17.

references that we might fairly expect, nor that he proposed to issue one day a supplementary volume to supply such deficiencies as he might observe, and for which it would appear that he collected some materials. We shall not wonder that, in very many cases, he does not give chapter and verse for the references which he makes, nor that the wording of the quotations is oftentimes inaccurate, so much so as to draw down upon him the charge of falsifying the authors to whom he appealed.

In 1577 he produced a small volume¹ containing some letters of SS. Gregory, Basil, and others, some dialogues of Lucian, some poems (first published in his edition of Anacreon), and a satire (*vid.* p. 5), which he describes as by "an uncertain author," and which was from the pen of the Chancellor de l'Hôpital. We do not say that Stephens intended to pass this off as the work of an old Latin poet; if he did, it would be no matter for surprise, for Greswell says that "the *fictum pro antiquo* was an exercise commonly practised by early scholars, and often with so much ingenuity as to deceive the best critics," p. 316. Stephens may have thought that the poem bore very sufficient indications of modern authorship. As a fact, however, it did deceive no less a scholar than Barthius (Gresw. ii. p. 333). In 1578 appeared "*Schediasmatum variorum, id est, Observationum, Emendationum, Expositionum, Disquisitionum libri tres, quæ sunt Pensæ succisivarum horarum Januarii, Februarii, Martii.*" April, May, and June followed some years later. So fond was Stephens of speaking of these productions, that they became a sort of byword among men, like Leunclavius² and others, with whom Stephens was no favourite. They are, however, remarkable productions, not clearly the hasty effusions which the title might lead us to suppose. They show the hold which Stephens had obtained over ancient litera-

¹ "Epistolia, Dialogi Breves, Oratiunculæ, Poëmata, ex variis utriusque linguae scriptoribus. Inter poëmata autem est *Satyra* elegantissima, quæ inscribitur *Lis*, non prius edita," 1577.

² Leunclavius had been severely handled by Stephens, and he retorts in his notes to his edition of Xenophon with great acrimony. While the work was in preparation Leunclavius died, and Sylburg became the actual publisher. He added a commendatory preface. This is noteworthy, as it would seem to show that a breach had taken place between himself and Stephens, of whom he speaks very kindly in his edition of Justin, in 1593.

ture, both Greek and Latin, and his power of producing from all sources passages which answered the purpose which he had in hand. In 1592 appeared the *Epistola ad Diognetum* and the *Oratio ad Græcos*. His career as an author was closed by the publication of a poem which bore upon the title-page, *Argentorati Bertramus*, 1596. He died two years afterwards in poverty in the hospital at Lyons.¹

As to the great attainments and literary ability of Stephens, no difference of opinion can be said to exist. On the discretion and even honesty with which he used his great powers, the opinions of persons capable of judging seem to differ widely. Some speak of his labours, of his emendations of the texts he edited, of the skill with which he detected the various errors of transcribers of ancient MSS., in terms of the highest commendation. Others seem hardly able to find words of sufficient bitterness in which to express their adverse opinion. Let it suffice to quote the words—words both of praise and blame—of the writer of the article on Plato in Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* p. 404, ed. 1849: "The edition of H. Stephanus is equally remarkable for the careful preparation of the text—by correcting mistakes of copyists and typographers, and introducing in several instances very felicitous improvements—and for the dishonesty with which the editor appropriated to himself the labours of others without any acknowledgment, and with various tricks strove to hide the source from which they were derived." There is no reason why any difference of opinion should exist. His own writings, if properly examined, must necessarily give a decisive yea, or an equally decisive nay, to the charges which have been brought against him.

When we turn, however, to consider H. Stephens from other points of view than that of mere scholarship, we find little sure ground on which to tread. His books are indeed to some extent our guide. He was a Protestant, and, as his *Thesaurus*, his translation of Calvin's *Catechism*, and other of his writings abundantly show, thoroughly conversant with all Christian literature to which he could find access. He never entered,

¹ Stephens lost the fortune which he inherited from his father, partly through his restless roving habits, partly through the expense of printing his *Thesaurus*, of the profits of which he was deprived by the publication of Scapula's abridgment.

however, the arena of polemical controversy properly so called. He was an unsparing denouncer of the vice and superstition of the age, and specially in all high places, as his *L'Apologie pour Hérodote* and his *Principum Monitrix Musa*, which Didot describes as his great work, "très hardi et très curieux," bear witness. But then, as Greswell points out, p. 157, though his opinions were the same as those of his father, he was never persecuted on account of them. He was never accused of disguising his opinions, and yet he remained at Paris unmolested long after his father had been forced to leave it. He was never indeed promoted to the dignity of "Typographus Regius," still he printed under the royal licence. The truth is, we know almost nothing of Henry Stephens outside of his books.

§ 2. There is one phase of Henry Stephens' mind which may be very plainly learned from his books, of which no biography, so far as we know, has taken any particular notice: we mean his excessive love of parody and of every kind of literary "equivoke." It was his delight to write "ut παραδός," to borrow an expression from the preface to his *Thesaurus*, in the first page of which two parodies are found.

(1.) In 1573 he published *Homeri et Hesiodi certamen. Matronis et aliorum parodiæ ex Homeri versibus parva immutatione lepidè detortis consutæ*. In the preface to the *Parodiæ* he expounds the various kinds of parody which he favoured. One kind consisted in applying the words of tragedy to comedy; a second, in putting the words of some poet to a very different use to that which the poet himself intended. Under this kind of parody the most solemn subjects might be treated of in language taken even from comedy. A third was simply the interweaving with an author's own words the words of some other writer. This last kind he also calls παραπλοκή. Thus almost every kind of use by one author of another was in his view parody, provided the use was hidden so far as possible. This book of Stephens' came into our hands at a very interesting moment. We had been engaged in an inquiry into the *Epistle to Diognetus*, falsely ascribed to Justin Martyr. We had satisfied ourselves that it was of late date, and made up of words and scraps of Greek gathered from many sources, and worked up with great skill into a sort of literary mosaic. We wanted some explanation of it, and some evidence to show that

a scholar, who alone could have written the *Epistle*, might possibly think of using such a method of composition. We shall now, out of the above-named preface, let Henry Stephens describe in his own words the kind of composition which the *Epistle to Diognetus* is. We shall only ask our readers to substitute some expression of wide meaning for the single volume of Homer of which he speaks:—

“Homericiς *παργύοις*, quorum nonnulla¹ in superioribus opusculis leguntur, aptissimè subjuncturum me putavi *παργύων* aliud quoddam genus: quod licet Homero non adscribatur, Homericum tamen aliqua ex parte est; utpote ex Homeri verbis, vel potius ex certis singulorum ejus versuum particulis artificiosè consarcinatum. Ingeniosè profectò istud furti genus fuit excogitatum, quod ejusmodi est ut vix furtum dici possit; adeo ut si reviviscens Homerus aliquem τῶν παρῳδῶν suos versus eo modo furantem vel ἐπαυτοφώρῳ deprehendisset, et illum in jus vocasset, in medio etiam Areopago causa fuisse casurum existimem. Quod tamen sic accipi velim tanquam de doctis furandi artificibus a me dictum. Quemadmodum enim scribit Xenophon, quanvis Lacedæmone furari impunè liceret, solitos tamen eos cædi qui non satis cautè furarentur; atque hoc minimè mirum debere videri ait, quum et in aliis rebus soleant vapulare discipuli qui non rite exequuntur quod edocti fuerint; ita certè eos qui Homero vel alii suos versus, vel potius certas suorum versuum postuinculos, non ea cautione qua decebat surripuissent, pœnas daturus fuisse existimo. Sed illi Xenophonteī fures non satis cautè furari dicebantur siquando contingeret ut in furto deprehenderentur: at παρῳδοίς in eo tantum adhibenda cautio est, ut quæ furati verba fuerint in alium usum convertant, qui tam remotus sit ab eo quem apud suum autorem habebant (quod attinet ad sensa quibus exprimendis adhibita erant) ut nihil tale illi dum iis uteretur, in mentem venisse dici possit” (p. 71).

With the substitution which we have suggested, this extract nearly exactly describes the *Epistle to Diognetus*. Stephens' words would lead us to conclude that he would be very lenient to such literary piracy, if only it was cleverly executed, and not found out. Detection clearly would be a great sin in his sight.

(2.) The book which we have just been using was not the only book which Stephens wrote on parodies. In 1575 he published a very singular volume called *Parodiæ Morales*. It is divided into two parts. The first is occupied by his own

¹ The *Hom. et Hes. Certamen*, which precedes.

parodies, which run on for nearly 150 pages. He heads the page with a line taken from a Latin poet. He then gives the Greek equivalent, then various parodies, leaving the opposite page blank for the insertion of such additional parodies as may occur to the reader. Let us take an example. He heads p. 144 with "Nemo repentè fuit turpissimus," Juv. *Sat.* i. 1. He then gives two Greek translations; then the *Parodiæ*, as follows: "Nemo repentè fuit teterrimus. Nemo repentè fuit nequissimus. Nemo repentè fuit parcissimus. Nemo repentè fuit lucri cupidissimus," and so on ten times over. There is, however, often more in these than meets the eye. "In omnibus parodiis, aut ad id quod experientia quotidiana docet, aut ad proverbium aliquod, vel celebrem quampiam historiam, aut ad aliam vel ejusdem vel alius poetæ, aut etiam oratoris sive historici cujuspiam sententiam, respexi," *Pref.* It thus happens that by a single word Stephens sometimes looks at a second passage, and by so doing combines that second passage with the one which he parodies. Thus in p. 104, where he takes for his subject "Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi," Hor. *Ep.* i. 2. 14 (of which he gives about eighty different parodies), he writes, "Effœtus nimia veneris deliria plector." In his preface he says that in the word "effœtus" he is looking at a certain passage in Cicero's *De Senectute*. Here again, we may remark, we have another very conspicuous feature in the composition of *Diognetus*, where again and again some sentence will be found to gather into itself a word or a thought out of several different parallels. Stephens' own Greek writing abounds with examples of this style of composition.

What we have just pointed out is further interesting as showing that he applied to the use of prose the same principles which in his other book he lays down as applicable by parodists to Homer's poetry.

In the preface to this volume he contends that the kind of parody of which we have just given examples was a novelty. He says that Plutarch knew nothing of it, or at any rate was silent respecting it; and that Chrysippus, though he might be thought to have done something of the same kind, still confined himself within far narrower limits. He speaks, too, of the profit to be derived from the exercise of parody of this sort :

“Necesse enim est ut qui sententiam aliquam poeticam per parodias latè propagare velit, multarum historiarum, multorum quæ vita quotidiana suppeditat exemplorum, quin etiam sententiarum quas alibi legit, rationem à memoria sua reposcat. ut taceam quantam synonymarum vocum varietatem, quarum delectus habendus, suggeri ab eadem oporteat. In plerisque certè sententiis, quot meæ sunt parodiæ, totidem ferè exempla eorum quæ illis dicuntur, in promptu fuerunt, partim ex celebrioribus historiis, partim ex iis quæ tempora nostra nos docuerunt, et quotidie docent, petita.”—*Pref.*

It must be evident from the consideration of what Stephens says here, and in the other passages which have been given, that if it should occur to any one not merely to write a line or two, but the sentences of a document of some length, on the methods which Stephens lays down, the writing as a whole would present, if carefully analysed, some most extraordinary features.

Let us go again to Stephens' preface for a description of these. He there tells us how he came to think of his new kind of parody. He was returning from Vienna on horseback, and meditating on the woes of his country, when the verse of Horace (given above) flashed across his mind. “Volvens et revolvens, cœpi tandem, ad fallendum itineris tædium, tot modis quot in hoc libro videbis (eighty of them), illum refingere: ita ut, velut Proteum quemdam, vultus alios atque alios sumere coegerim.” This illustration aptly applies to what would be found on a careful analysis of the writing of which we have just spoken. At one moment you would fancy that you had (say) Clement of Alexandria before you, at another Hippolytus or Justin Martyr, or perhaps some secular author. On no one of them could you fairly lay hold. You could not say that any sentence was plainly taken from any one of those writers, for the simple reason that it was taken from all. This is exactly what is found on the careful analysis of the *Epistle to Diognetus* and some other writings. Each sentence is a very Proteus. We now and again see a face that recalls something of several persons seen in bygone days; but which of all these the face is like, we cannot tell. Such are the sentences of writings of the class to which the *Epistle to Diognetus* belongs. The fact is that these writings are parodies—in Stephens' sense—from the beginning to the end. Now and then they offend by burlesques—parodies in our more usual meaning—of

sacred, or, at any rate, grave matters. Often their writers reverse this, and write a grave sentence in such a way that the passage from which they copy becomes a burlesque on their own sentence. We have a notable instance of this last in *Diognet.* ix., where a passage¹ which has won universal admiration is so written that a somewhat extravagant passage on the Virgin Mary, in a homily of John of Damascus, reads very like a parody of the epistle. The idea of this kind of parody would probably be taken from the *Homero-Centones*, ascribed to Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius II. This poem deals with the gravest subjects,—the fate of man, the incidents in the life of our Lord, the resurrection, etc.,—and is entirely taken out of Homer, and composed in the fashion which Stephens has already described to us. Eudocia's poem is discussed at great length in the second part of the *Parodiæ Morales*; and the Homeric sources of a considerable portion of it are pointed out.

Stephens' reference to Proteus, in connection with his parodies, is made the more interesting from the circumstance that, after tracking the *Epistle* and some other writings from author to author, and from treatise to treatise, we at last traced them, one and all, to the account of the life and death of Peregrinus Proteus, which is given in the *De Morte Peregrini*, commonly ascribed to Lucian. This narrative can hardly be by Lucian; and we shall see presently how curiously the writings which we have in view seem indebted to the very sentences, pages, or histories to which Peregrinus appears also to be indebted, the materials used by the one being used perhaps by some of the others, or perhaps by all of them, but in different ways. That Stephens had perfect knowledge of this

¹ Οὐδὲ ἔμνησικακήσεν, ἀλλὰ ἔμακροθύμησεν, αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν ἀπίδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν . . . ὃ τῆς γλυκειᾶς ἀνταλλαγῆς, ὃ τῆς ἀνεξιχνιάστου δημιουργίας, ὃ τῶν ἀπροσδοκήτων εὐεργεσιῶν, *Diognet.* ix. Comp. καὶ γε ὁ Κύριος εἰσῆκουσεν αὐτῶν, ὁ παχὺς εἰς ἔλεον, βραδὺς δὲ εἰς ὀργήν, δὸς τὴν κυριάνυμον Μαρίαν λύτρον οὕτως ἀγλαὸν καὶ μεγαλοφυὲς ἀντὶ τῆς Εὐας. . . . ὃ τῆς εὐεργεσίας! ὃ τῆς μεγαλοδωρεῖας! . . . ὃ τῆς ἑξαλλαγῆς τῶν πραπτομένων, *Hom.* ii. in *Nat. B. V. Mar.* v. p. 852, with ὡς ἀξιάγαστος ἡ δημιουργία in p. 851. The whole passage as it stands in the epistle is most carefully built up. In almost every word the writer is "looking at" some passage more or less illustrative of his main thought. Other coincidences—in other parts of the epistle—with the passages so "looked at" prove the obligation, and the whole is an excellent and elaborate illustration of Stephens' description of his own parodies.

fact, and that his reference to Proteus is an allusion to it, we shall hereafter see abundant reason for believing.

(3.) In his preface to *Parodia Morales*, Stephens quotes certain lines expressing the admiration which was felt when Echo was first heard. He says: "Hic ex variis Homeri locis excerptos videmus versus, qui quum ad valde diversos apud eum sermones pertineant, sic ad unum eundemque sunt hic aptati, ut plerique qui illos esse Homericos ignorent, non per abusum ita usurpari, sed hunc primum et verum esse illorum usum sint credituri."—P. 9. The same may be said of the poems of Eudocia and of other such like poetry. If any one, being ignorant of Homer, were to maintain that Eudocia's poetry was purely from her own brain, our course would be that which Stephens takes. We should produce the lines of Homer to which Eudocia was indebted. We should contend that the coincidences between her lines and Homer's were very numerous, and some of them very remarkable; and that the theory of accidental coincidence could not possibly hold. There would be no difficulty in this, for such poetry as Eudocia's is avowedly Homeric. We could give back to Homer the half lines, phrases, and words taken from him. About some words and phrases used several times by Homer there would be a momentary difficulty,—we should hesitate as to which out of several places we ought to assign them. We should therefore look at each place to see what other borrowed words or phrases we could observe in the near neighbourhood which would seem to indicate that Eudocia's eye had passed that way. Our evidence from first to last would consist of verbal coincidences. For every line of Eudocia's poetry these would be found.

Now it will follow from this, that if the *Epistle to Diognetus* and the other writings which are in our thoughts have been written, as we assert that they have, on the principles which Stephens has marked out for the composition of the various kinds of parody which he describes, then an immense number of verbal coincidences will be found between them and the authors who, in these writings, take the place of Homer. This is exactly what is found in the case of the writings with which we deal. Their sentences can be reconstructed out of other authors, just as Eudocia's lines out of Homer's. The argument is the same in both cases. These verbal coincidences, we con-

tend, are too numerous, and some of them too remarkable, to permit us to suppose that they can as a whole have arisen accidentally. One thing, however, must be noted: any six lines of Eudocia's poetry, when carefully analysed, will suffice to show the character of the whole. The use of Homer was not expressly concealed. In our writings the use of other authors was very carefully hidden. We cannot, therefore, deal with them in the same summary fashion as we can with the Homeric parodies. We shall expect to meet with verbal coincidences at every turn, but we shall not expect many of these to be of that decisive stamp which at once proves Eudocia's lines to be in truth Homer's. In the writings with which we deal it is necessary to take account of the force of cumulative evidence. This is needless in the case of the Homeric¹ parodies. In short, we must not expect to find detached pieces of evidence which would at once, without further inquiry, have proved our writings frauds on the day they were first published.

¹ There are also in existence *Centones Virgiliani*. Disraeli's *Cur. Lit.* gives some interesting information in the chapter on *Parodies*, as also in that on *Literary Follies*, among which the compositions spoken of above are classed. The author says: "A Cento primarily signifies a cloak made of patches. In poetry it denotes a work wholly composed of verses or passages promiscuously taken from other authors, only disposed in a new form or order, so as to compose a new work and a new meaning. Ausonius has laid down the rules to be observed in composing *Centos*. The pieces may be taken either from the same poet or from several; and the verses may be either taken entire, or divided into two—one half to be connected with another half taken elsewhere; but two verses are never to be taken together. Agreeable to these rules he has made a pleasant nuptial *Cento* from Virgil," *Lit. Foll.* It is worth observing that the *Editio Princeps* of Ausonius' writings, together with the *Probæ Centones*, was published in 1472. It is fair to conclude that the subject of parodial writing was beginning to excite some interest. The poems of Calpurnius, which, if not written upon Ausonius' plan, are at any rate greatly indebted to many of the Latin poets, were added to the above-named volume, perhaps for this reason. Stephens was the first to call public attention to the subject.

CHAPTER III.

COINCIDENCES.

WE shall now give a few examples of the coincidences which we have found. They will indeed come before us hereafter in the course of our inquiry, and we shall then see the *way* in which they are found, which is a matter to be taken into consideration in estimating their value. Our coincidences are, however, far too numerous to permit of a close examination of each as we come upon it; it may be well, therefore, to select a few for more particular investigation. For the sake of considering their collective as well as their individual weight, we shall take them all from one document.

§ 1. (1.) In Clem. Rom. i. 1 is the expression: ἐπαλλήλους συμφοράς. Ἐπάλληλος is, of course, a common enough word; but we know of only two other examples of the complete expression. One is found in the scholiast on Lycophron, 243 (p. 49, Canter.), the other in Euseb. *H. E.* i. 8, p. 24: ταῖς κατὰ τὸν οἶκον ἐπαλλήλοις συμφοραῖς. Clement has τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον lower down in the same § 1.

(2.) In Clem. i. 2 we find ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες. “Doubtless,” Lightfoot¹ remarks, “a reference to our Lord’s words recorded Acts xx. 35: μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.” Lightfoot goes on to show that “maxims similarly expressed had been uttered” by the Epicureans, quoting Plut. *Mor.* p. 778 C: Ἐπίκουρος τοῦ εὖ πάσχειν τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν οὐ μόνον κάλλιον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἥδιον εἶναί φησι. Lower down, in the same section, Clement writes: ἐπὶ πάσῃ ἀγαθοποιῷ, ἔτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν, from Titus iii. 1. We have seen that Stephens, by the use of a single word, “looked at” a passage in Cicero, *De Senect.* Does the ἥδιον of Clement in like manner look at the saying of Epicurus as quoted by Plutarch? It may be accidental, no doubt. Is it accidental? It is at any rate remarkable that Plutarch has on the same page, 778, some words

¹ *S. Clement of Rome*, London and Cambridge, 1869; *S. Clement of Rome, an Appendix*, London, 1877.

just as parallel to Clement's second reference as Epicurus' saying is to Clement's first. Plutarch writes: τοὺς δ' ἄρχοντας οἱ συνόντες τῶν φιλοσόφων δικαιοτέρους ποιοῦσι καὶ μετριοτέρους καὶ προθυμότερους εἰς τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν. Compare these last words with Clement's second quotation. Plutarch, moreover, immediately above writes: τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν αἰδῶ καὶ τιμὴν αἱ πόλεις νέμουσιν. With the two passages of Plutarch compare ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν πρεσβυτέροις· νέοις τε μέτρια, κ.τ.λ., *Ep. i. 1*. Compare, further, with Clement and Plutarch: ὅτι ἔτοιμοί ἐστε εἰς εὐποιῖαν Θεῷ ἀνήκουσαν (cf. Clement's καθήκουσαν), Ignat. *Polyc. 7*; θέλουσιν γὰρ ὑμῖν εὖ πράσσειν Θεὸς ἔτοιμος εἰς τὸ παρασχεῖν, *Smyrn. 11*; ἔτοιμότερον γὰρ ἑαυτὸν λέγει ὁ Κύριος εἰς τὸ διδόναι τοῦ αἰτοῦντος, *Clem. ii. 15* (*vid. infra*, c. iv. 2).

It will not be denied that the two sets of coincidences, the first with Eusebius and the second with Plutarch, are what we should expect to find if Clement's Epistle were written upon the method we have set forth.

(3.) In *Ep. i. 36*, Clement writes: ἐν ᾗ εὕρομεν τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν . . . τὸν προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν. Compare ἥς (νόσου) σε προστάτην σωτήρα τ', ὦναξ, μοῦνον ἐξευρίσκομεν, *Soph. Œd. R. 303*. This looks as though the word προστάτης had excited some little attention. It will come before us again when we compare Clement's Epistles with *De Morte Peregrini*, where the word is found. Meanwhile see the next coincidence (*vid. cc. vi. vii.*).

(4.) In *Ep. i. 5*, Clement calls S. Peter and S. Paul τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους. The epithet has attracted some attention. Lightfoot (*Addenda*, p. 406) says: "Harnack appositely quotes *Clem. Hom. i. 16*: ὁ δ' ἀγαθὸς Πέτρος προσπηδήσας, κ.τ.λ." The reference is a just one. In § 19, the writer of the homily says: τὸν μὲν οὖν βοηθὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἀληθῆ προφήτην λέγω, ὃς μόνος φωτίσαι ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων δύναται, ὥστ' ἂν αὐτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς δυνηθῇναι ἡμᾶς ἐνιδεῖν τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας τὴν ὁδόν. Compare αὕτη ἡ ὁδός, ἀγαπητοί, ἐν ᾗ εὕρομεν τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν, τὸν προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν. διὰ τούτου ἀτεινίσωμεν εἰς τὰ ὑψηλὰ τῶν οὐρανῶν διὰ τούτου ἐνοπτριζόμεθα τὴν ἁμαρτον καὶ ὑπερτάτην ὁψιν αὐτοῦ διὰ τούτου ἠνεώχθησαν ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας διὰ τούτου ἡ ἀσύνητος καὶ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς

τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, Clem. i. 36. Still more “appositely,” however, we may quote Cyr. Jer. *Cat.* vi. 15: παρατεινομένης δὲ τῆς πλάνης, ἀγαθῶν ξυνωρὶς διορθοῦται τὸ πταῖσμα, Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος παραγενόμενοι, οἱ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας προστάται.

The word *προστάτης* is made of considerable importance by Photius’ animadversions. He says (of Clement): ἀρχιερέα καὶ προστάτην τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν ἐξονομάζων οὐδὲ τὰς θεοπρεπεῖς καὶ ὑψηλοτέρας ἀφῆκε περὶ αὐτοῦ φωνάς, *Bibl.* 126. It is noteworthy that Cyril’s is the earliest Christian use of the word which is in any sort parallel to Clement’s. The preceding coincidence suggests that an interest was felt in the word. The indications here are in the same direction. Does it not *look* as though Cyril’s use of the word had been examined and ἀγαθός borrowed, and as though, in like manner, from the homily had been taken βοηθός, with somewhat more? Any way, the double set of coincidences aptly illustrates our theory.

(5.) In *Ep.* i. 12, Clement speaks of Rahab and the spies (*κατασκόπων*); presently he uses the word ἐναλλάξ. Diodorus Siculus (xvii. 33) begins a chapter, which might easily suggest the scriptural account of the taking of Jericho, with *κατασκόπων*. He, too, presently uses ἐναλλάξ. We shall see hereafter that Clement has a great many coincidences with Diodorus in the immediate neighbourhood of c. 33.

(6.) In the same § 12, Clement applies ὑπερῶν, and presently στέγος, to Rahab’s dwelling. The narrative as given in Josh. ii. requires the word δῶμα, which is there found. In *Evang. Thom.* ix. p. 142 (Tisch. 1853), δῶμα, ὑπερῶν, στέγον are all used, and they are followed presently by ἐναλλάκτης. This last word is applied to a part of a bedstead. The only other use of it that we have been able to find is by Aquila (Isa. iii. 4), where it means “an exchanger.” Compare with Clement’s ἐναλλάξ, which must be taken in the “strange” sense of “‘crosswise,’ i.e. ‘in an opposite direction,’” *Light. Add.* p. 412, *vid.* c. v.

(7.) Clem. *Ep.* i. 19: τὸ ταπεινοφρονοῦν καὶ τὸ ὑποδεῖς διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς οὐ μόνον ἡμᾶς ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πρὸ ἡμῶν γενεάς βελτίους ἐποίησεν, τοὺς τε καταδεξαμένους τὰ λόγια αὐτοῦ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. Compare περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ κενοδοξίας. λόγος. κ. Ἀμήχανον τὸν μὴ καταδεξάμενον τὸ πρὸς πάντας ὑποδεῖς καὶ ἔσχατον, κ.τ.λ. Sym. *Metaph. Serm.* xx. 1, p. 575 (quoting

Basil, *Ps.* lxi. p. 193), with καταδεξάμενος τὰ ἐγκλήματα, καὶ μὴ ἀληθῆ ἤ, only twelve lines below, but in another extract from Basil. The aptness of the parallel cannot be questioned.

It is, however, made still more noteworthy from another circumstance. Canon Lightfoot (*Addenda*, p. 418) writes: "τὸ ὑποδέεζ, 'submissiveness,' 'subordination.' This seems to be the meaning of the word, which is very rare in the positive though common in the comparative: ὑποδέεστερος; see Epiphan. *Hær.* lxxvii. 14: τὸ ὑποδέεζ καὶ ἡλαττωμένον, a passage pointed out to me by Bensly. Accordingly, in the Syriac it is rendered *diminutio et demissio*." (Lightfoot, in his *Addenda*, gives the variations found in the Syriac version of Clement's Epistles.) Nothing can well be stranger than that the Syriac version should be in close contact with Epiphanius, while the Greek is in equally close contact with Basil. If it were lawful to take a late date for Clement's Epistle, one would suppose that a scholarly interest had been taken in τὸ ὑποδέεζ. See c. vi., where the word comes up again.

(8.) In the same § 19, Clement writes: βούλημα νοήσωμεν πῶς ἀόργητος ὑπάρχει πρὸς πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν αὐτοῦ, with τὴν λειτουργίαν¹ αὐτῶν ἀπροσκόπως ἐπιτελοῦσιν shortly afterwards in § 20; and in § 61: μηδὲν ἐναντιούμενους τῷ θελήματί σου οἷς δὲς, Κύριε . . . εἰς τὸ διέπειν αὐτοὺς τὴν ὑπὸ σοῦ δεδομένην αὐτοῖς ἡγεμονίαν ἀπροσκόπως. Compare χρῆ δὲ . . . περὶ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐναντιούμενα, ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ λέξει, ὁμολογεῖν, μὴ νοεῖν. Οἶον, κατὰ τὰς κοινὰς προλήψεις ἐστὶ τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἀγαθὴν, καὶ ἀόργητον, καὶ δικαίαν ὁμολογεῖν, with βούλημα . . . καὶ οὕτως ἀπροσκόπως ἐντευζόμεθα ταῖς Γραφαῖς just below, Basil in *Is.* Proœm. 5, p. 381.² We are not aware of any other example of the use of the word ἀπροσκόπως.

Here again the double coincidence of Clement with Basil in the word ἀπροσκόπως is suggestive.

(9.) In Clem. *Ep.* i. 20 is the word διχοστατοῦσα. It is not a very common one. It is found in Stobæus, *Flor.*

¹ Ἀνέμων σταθμοὶ κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον καιρὸν τὴν λειτ. ἀ. ἀ. ἰ. Cf. οὐχὶ πάντες εἰς λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα κ.τ.λ., Heb. i. 14. The origin of the joke—for it is nothing else—will be shown hereafter. See Diod. Sic. iii. 16.

² P. 380, ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν σφοδρότατης ἐνατενίσσεως, and in the same sentence καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς διανοίγοντος εἰς κατανόησιν ὧν βούλεται θεαμάτων. Compare ἀτενίσσωμεν εἰς τὸν πατέρα . . . ἐμβλίσσωμεν τοῖς ὀμμασιν τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ μακρόθυμον αὐτοῦ βούλημα, still in Clement's short § 19.

xlili. 21, p. 83 (Meineke), in a fragment of Eurip. *Antig.* If any one should choose to conjecture that the word is taken from that source, he will find in the same place of Stobæus very excellent support for his opinion. The preceding extract in Stobæus is a fragment from Eurip. *Æol.*, which Lightfoot points out to be used by Clement in *Ep.* i. 37. The latter part of the fragment, which Lightfoot shows to be used in § 38, is found only in Stobæus. Above this fragment in Stobæus is an extract of only three lines. We then find some lines from Sophocles' *Ajar.* Clement's editors point out that those very lines are used in § 37,¹ and in the very sentence in which the fragment from Euripides is used. The words in § 37, common to Clement, with Sophocles and Euripides, Canon Lightfoot prints as being quotations.

It is impossible to suppose that the two passages had become linked together in the mind of Stobæus by means of Clement's Epistle; for not even once, so far as we can find, does he quote any Christian writer. We are driven to the conclusion that the remarkable coincidence we have just pointed out is accidental,—which seems an unreasonable conclusion,—or else that Clement's Epistle is not so early as it has been commonly supposed to be.

¹ In *Ep.* i. 37, Clement says: οἱ μεγάλοι δίχα τῶν μικρῶν οὐ δύνανται εἶναι, οὔτε οἱ μικροὶ δίχα τῶν μεγάλων· σύγκρασις τις ἐστὶν ἐν πᾶσιν, καὶ ἐν ταύτοις χρῆσις, and in § 38: ὁ πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγέτω τῷ πτωχῷ, ὁ δὲ πτωχὸς εὐχαριστεῖτω τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ. On the first of these Lightfoot says: "See *Soph. Aj.* 158 (quoted by Jacobson): καίτοι μικροὶ μεγάλων χωρὶς σφαλερὸν πύργου ῥῦμα πέλονται, κ.τ.λ.," and on σύγκρασις, κ.τ.λ. "This seems to be a reference to Eurip. *Æol.* 2: ἀλλ' ἐστὶ τις σύγκρασις ὥστ' ἔχειν καλῶς, for Euripides is there speaking of the mutual co-operation of rich and poor." On the passage from § 38 he writes: "See Eurip. *Fragm. Æol.* 2: ἃ μὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ τῷ πίννῃτι, πλούσιος δίδωσ'· ἃ δ' οἱ πλουτοῦντες οὐ κεκτῆμεθα, τοῖσιν πίννῃσι χρώμενοι ἐνρώμεθα. The resemblance here confirms the conjecture that in the earlier passage Clement has the words of Euripides in his mind." Two lines of the fragment (but not those used in § 38) are quoted three times by Plutarch. There are some indications from which it might be argued that all three of these were consulted by the writer of the epistle. The lines are found in *Mor.* p. 25. Immediately above them we observe ἐν πᾶσιν used by Clement in the same sentence as the lines in § 37 (see above); in the following sentence in Plutarch is χρῆται. Clement uses the exact word directly in § 37. In *Mor.* p. 369, the lines are found again, and in the next sentence ἰσχυρὰν καὶ δυσξάλειπτον, οὐκ ἐν λόγοις μόνον. Clement, in § 38, where he is using the latter part of the fragment, writes: ὁ ἰσχυρὸς μὴ ἀτημιλείτω τὴν ἀσθενῆ, followed directly by μὴ ἐν λόγοις. Ἀσθενῆ is exactly found in *Mor.* p. 474, where the lines are used for the third time by Plutarch.

We have not brought these coincidences forward, however, at this point for the sake of their bearing upon the question of the genuineness, or otherwise, of Clement's Epistle. This is not the question immediately before us. We have wished to give at the outset of our investigations some proof that coincidences—selected, not as being the strongest that could be given, but for their representative character—can be produced out of the group of writings which we examine, which do seem on the face of them to bear out the theory of composition which we have already set forth. It can hardly be denied that they do. There is upon the face of them—if they be not accidental—a seeming interest in words, and in the grouping of words. Stephens (*Par. Mor.* pt. ii. p. 11) describes the two poems of Homer as supplying “*amplam rerum et verborum sylvam*” for the purposes of Eudocia and other parodists. The coincidences we have just produced—if they are not accidental—certainly do look as though the writer regarded the books with which he deals as “*sylvas*,” from which to take not plants and slips, instinct with original life, to be transplanted into his own borders, but timber, to be cut, and carved, and polished by him at his pleasure.

We have taken the foregoing coincidences, all of them, from Clement's *Ep.* i., for the sake of the support which they mutually give to one another. It must be allowed that their value is immensely increased by the fact that they concern one and the same writing.

We, of course, admit that the first of our coincidences, that of Clement's i. 1 with Eusebius, might accidentally arise. The question, however, which the critic will ask, is not whether a particular coincidence *may* be accidental, but whether it *is*. To this question, the other coincidences give a cumulative as well as an individual answer. We cannot afford to be insensible to the force of cumulative evidence.

The *Epistle to Diognetus* would equally as well have served our purpose as Clement's *Ep.* i. We selected Clement because we do not for one moment wish to conceal the fact that we include his epistle in the group of writings which we believe to be utterly fraudulent. Knowing what we know, or think we know, it would not be fair dealing to keep this fact in reserve. We wish to have the whole matter discussed on

its merits. We are quite prepared to find that there are some persons whose minds are so made up on the question of the genuineness of Clement's *Ep.* i. that they will be unable to give our arguments any patient hearing. But there are also men of calmer minds who will inquire what the meaning is of the facts we bring forward, and without prejudice or passion consider whether it is conceivable that mere ingenuity can build up a charge of fraud, so elaborate as ours will be found to be, on the basis only of accidental coincidences.

§ 2. We shall now take a verbal coincidence, again with Clement, which will lead us to the subject of our immediate inquiry, Lucian's *De Morte Peregrini*, and also give us an example of one of those specially curious class of coincidences in which a number of writings meet together in the pages of an author of whom, as of one another, they are supposed to be wholly independent.

In *Ep.* i. 58, it is said: ἐλλόγιμος ἔσται εἰς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σωζομένων. Lightfoot remarks that ἐλλόγιμος is "used here, as in § 57, for those who have a place among the elect of God;" and he says: "Comp. Plato, *Phileb.* 17 E: οὐκ ἐλλόγιμον οὐδ' ἐνἀριθμον." The four next words are necessary to show the coincidence with Clement: ἅτ' οὐκ εἰς ἀριθμὸν κ.τ.λ. From this we may gather that Clement felt some interest in ἐλλόγιμος. He uses the same word, but in a somewhat different sense, in §§ 44, 62. In § 44 he writes: διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, and in § 62: ἐλλογιμωτάτοις καὶ ἐγκεκυφόσιν (see note, p. 29) εἰς τὰ λόγια τῆς παιδείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. Cf. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* i. 48, p. 123: ὡς δὴ τις ἐλλογίμων προφητῶν γεγονώς καὶ μηδὲν ἄνευ χρησμῶν εἰσθῶς πράττειν τὸ παράπαν, ὑπανεδύετο λέγων οὐκ ἐπιτρέπειν αὐτῷ βαδίζειν τὸ θεῖον. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἥκοντες ἐπανήσαν ἀπρακτοὶ πρὸς βασιλείαν ἕτεροι δὲ εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν χρεῖαν ἐχειροτονοῦντο τῶν δοκιμωτέρων, κ.τ.λ. Philo thus, out of the same passage, supplies a parallel for two places in which Clement uses ἐλλόγιμος. Unless we fall back upon "accident," we must needs confess that Clement's sentences are concocted out of Philo and also out of Plato. Can this be the work of the Clement of Rome? For further illustration we may add

from Philo: τὰ μὲν πρότερα πάντα, εἶπεν, ἐστὶ λόγια καὶ χρησμοί, p. 127.

(1.) We shall now give some coincidences with the same pages of Philo out of five other writings. The sentence immediately above that first given from Philo begins thus: ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἐξέπεμπε τῶν ἐταίρων τινάς (p. 122); and presently, as we have seen, we find ἐχειροτονοῦντο and διηγούμενος. Compare καὶ τινας ἐπὶ τούτῳ (τούταν, v.l.), πρεσβευτὰς τῶν ἐταίρων ἐχειροτόνησε, Lucian, *Peregrin.* 41, with διηγουμένου just below.

(2.) On the same p. 122, Philo writes: συμπλακεῖς δὲ οὐ πρὸς ἀμελετήτους καὶ ἀνασκήτους ἔγνω τὴν μάχην οὔσαν, ἀλλ' ἀθλητὰς πολέμων ἀηττήτους τῷ ὄντι, οἱ πρὸ μικροῦ πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἠνδραγαθίσαντο, σαμάτων ἀλκὴν καὶ φρόνημα διανοίας καὶ ἀρετῆς ὕψος ἐπιδειξάμενοι, with τὰ πρῶτα τῶν ἀθλων in the next sentence. Compare στεφανούσθω δὲ ὁ μὲν δρομικὸς ἀθλητῆς ἔλαφον παρελθών, ἢ ἵππον· ὁ δὲ τὰ βαρύτερα ἀσκῶν, ταύρῳ συμπλακεῖς ἢ ἄρκτῳ, ὃ ἐγὼ ὁσημέραι πράττω, μέγαν ἀθλον ἀφηρημένης μοι τῆς τύχης. Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* (Herodes) ii. 7. Compare further with both: ὅτι ἔθος ἦν τοῖς Ῥωμαίων στραιώταις, ἥνικα ὁ στρατηγὸς αὐτῶν, σὺν αὐτοῖς μάχῃ πρὸς τινας τῶν πολεμίων συμπλακεῖς, ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἐξακισχιλίους τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐφαίνετο ἀνελών, ἱμπεράτορα αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύειν καὶ ἀποκαλεῖν, ὃ ἐστὶ βασιλέα. An excerpt from Diodorus Siculus, Photius, *Bibl.* 244, p. 391. Philo immediately above the sentence given above has ἐχθρῶν, βασιλέα, ἀνελών, ἐμβαλάν. This last word is exactly found in Photius a few lines above.

(3.) We quoted above from Philo, p. 127: λόγια καὶ χρησμοί. After two lines we find φυλάξασθαι; on p. 126: χαλεπῶς ἐνεγκών; on p. 124: μακρὰν ἀποδημίαν. Compare φυλάξασθαι τὸν τόπον τὸν ἐνεγκόντα τὸν διμορφον with τὸν χρησμόν and τὸ λόγιον in the next line; and with μακρὰν ἀποδημίαν eleven lines below, and after a few lines βαρέως ἐνεγκεῖν. Excerpt (on hermaphrodites) from Diodorus Siculus, Photius, *Bibl.* 244, p. 377.

(4.) Philo writes in p. 125: ἐπεὶ ὁ λόγος ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτῷ. Compare ὅτι πᾶς λόγος αὐτοῦ ἔργον ἐστὶν ἑτοιμον, *Evang. Thom.* A, 17, p. 147.

(5.) Philo is here speaking of Balak and Balaam, and the sin into which the prophet led the children of Israel, and of the act of Phinehas. On p. 124 he writes: τῇ δὲ ὑστεραίᾳ . . .

ὁ Βαλάκης . . . στήλην συνέβαιεν ιδρύσθαι δαιμονίου τινός (τῇ ὑστερ. and δαιμον. in Philostratus, a few lines below the passage given above); on p. 128: πορνεία κειμένους ἀνελών with δοθείσης δὲ ἀδείας in the next sentence. Presently, on same page: τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ¹ γένους. Lower down, on same page: τὸ παράδειγμα . . . ἀνελόντες, τὸ μὲν μίasma τοῦ ἔθνους, all in same sentence. Presently, in the beginning of p. 129: τετρακισχιλίους δὲ φασὶ πρὸς τοῖς δισμυρίοις ἀναιρεθῆναι μίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ. Compare 3 Macc. vii. 10: τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ γένους; in ver. 11: τοὺς γαστροὺς ἔνεκεν τὰ θεῖα παραβεβηκότας; in ver. 12: ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἄδειαν; in ver. 14: τῶν μεμιασμένων ὁμοεθνῇ . . . καὶ μετὰ παραδειγματισμῶν ἀνῆρουν; in ver. 15: ἐκείνῃ δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνείλον ὑπὲρ τοὺς τριακοσίους ἄνδρας; in ver. 20: ἐν στήλῃ . . . καθιδρύσαντες. The close of the third book of Maccabees describes how the plans of Ptolemy Philopator were defeated; how the people prayed the king to suffer them to take vengeance on those of their nation who had broken God's commands; how, permission being granted to them, they slew 300, and then with great joy kept a solemn feast.

We do not lay stress on the things which we have now pointed out in themselves alone, but on the singular fact that they are all here found together in Philo, and that the five writings, Clement's *Epistle*, Lucian's *Peregrin.*, Philostratus, *Vit. Her.*, Photius, *Bibl.* 244 (two excerpts), the *Evang. Thom.*, and 3 Macc., to which the coincidences pointed out relate, are all closely connected together, as we shall see hereafter. We shall find many coincidences of the same kind as this, and we must bear in mind here again their cumulative force.

¹ In the next line Philo has μήτε κυκυφότα εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος. Comp. Clement's ἐγκυκυφόσιν εἰς τὰ λόγια, quoted on p. 27.

CHAPTER IV.

DE MORTE PEREGRINI.

WE must now pay particular attention to the treatise *De Morte Peregrini*, to which Philo, to whom we went for the purpose of comparing his use of ἑλλόγιμος with that of Clement, has introduced us.

§ 1. The story of Proteus Peregrinus, as Lucian tells it, is on this wise.

Happening to pass by the gymnasium at Elis, he heard a cynic, by name Theagenes, railing at all the world in general, and in particular at those persons who accused Proteus of vainglory; for, he said, had not Hercules done the like, and had not Empedocles jumped into the crater? Lucian inquired what all this might mean, and he was told that Proteus intended to burn himself at Olympia. Theagenes left off speaking, and, bathed in tears and pulling his hair (but not too hard), was carried away by his friends.

Another orator, whose name is not given, immediately mounted the rostrum.

Theagenes, he said, had concluded his oration with the tears of Heraclitus, but he would begin his with the laughter of Democritus. And then he laughed until his laughter became contagious, and Lucian and the rest joined him.

The orator then went on to tell what he knew, or had heard, about the image of deity (Proteus) of whom Theagenes was so enamoured. In his early days, he said, Proteus had been taken in adultery, and compelled to undergo the usual punishment thereof. Not content with scandalous things of that kind, he had, so the story went, been guilty of killing his father. After that exploit he had to leave his native city, and to wander from place to place. Being in Palestine, he became a Christian, and so rapidly surpassed his teachers, that presently he became their president (προστάτης). It happened, however, that he was thrown into prison for introducing new mysteries, just as the Crucified One, the object of Christian

worship, had done before him. This was a fine thing, the orator said, for Proteus, and greatly ministered to his thirst for fame. The Christians flocked to his assistance, and he soon amassed a large sum of money. The governor of Syria, however, saw that this imprisonment only ministered to Proteus' vainglory, and so after a trial he let him go. Proteus then, the orator proceeded, returned home, only to find, however, that his crimes were not forgotten. He therefore let his beard grow, and assumed the garb of a cynic philosopher, and declared that he gave all his property to the people of Parium. This made him a fine fellow, but, of course, reduced him to poverty. Proteus therefore started a second time on his travels. At first, he threw himself upon the charity of the Christians, but presently ruined himself with them by eating forbidden things. In his distress he begged of the emperor to be allowed to recall his generous gift to Parium, which was, of course, refused.

Proteus then started on a third journey, this time to Agathobulus, an Egyptian philosopher. There, the orator said, he shaved half his head, and daubed himself with mud, and behaved in a most obscene and ridiculous fashion, and certainly succeeded in gaining the credit of being a most extraordinary fellow. From Egypt he went to Italy, where at once he began to abuse everybody, and specially the emperor, the meekest of men; and, altogether, he behaved in such a way, that it at last became necessary to tell him that philosophers of his stamp were not wanted at Rome. He turned this dismissal to profit, however. Epictetus and others had been dismissed for plain speaking, and why not Proteus?

Thence he went to Greece, to Elis, and, of course, took to railing. This time he fell foul of that excellent man (Herodes Atticus) who, at his own expense, brought water to Olympia, to the great relief of the spectators at the Olympic games. As, however, he was at that moment drinking the said water, his language was considered intolerable, and he was obliged once more to take himself off. And back Proteus had come, the orator said, at the next Olympiad; but as the people had found him out, and had become accustomed to his tricks, he had determined, by way of novelty, that he would burn himself alive. Doubtless he had made a convenient and safe

receptacle for himself in the midst of the funeral pile. Proteus wanted, he supposed, to change his name, and take that of Phœnix, that well-known bird. Theagenes, the orator proceeded, had given them some Sibylline verses about that same Proteus. He would match them, he said, with one of Bacis' oracular utterances. The fox cubs, they heard from Bacis, were to follow this precious cynic to the flames. Was Bacis a worse soothsayer than the sibyl? Would it not be well if Proteus' admirable friends would volatilize (ἑξαερώσουσι) themselves? That was, he thought, their term for burning.

As the people began to exclaim, "Let them be burned, for they are worthy of the fire," the orator stepped down laughing.

Lucian then went on to Olympia to see the end, for the whole thing gave him infinite amusement. He found Proteus uttering his own funeral oration, recounting his great deeds, and saying that he wished to put a golden crown, or finish, to a golden life, and die like Heracles, and mingle with the air; that he would teach men to despise death, and that he hoped that every man would be his Philoctetes. When Proteus had finished, the more foolish of his audience urged him (as he had hoped) to save his precious life in pity to the Greeks. The more manly folk, however, bade him to fulfil his purpose. You will imagine how I laughed, says Lucian, when his cheek grew deadly pale; and when, from fear, he was obliged to cease speaking, no one could pity such a vainglorious fool.

Lucian then describes the closing scene. The funeral pile was prepared, and the moon, as was fitting, shone out upon the noble deed, and Proteus appeared, torch in hand. With him was Theagenes, also armed with a torch; and right well he played the second part in the comedy. They fired the pile from either side. Proteus then—and note this well, Lucian says—divested himself of his wallet, and cloak, and Heracleian club, and stood forth in an unquestionably dirty shirt; then casting frankincense into the fire, and facing the south, and breathing a prayer to his maternal and paternal gods, he sprang into the flames, and was seen no more. As Proteus named the paternal deities, I remembered *that* murder of his, and could no longer contain my laughter, Lucian remarks.

As Lucian was returning, he met people on the road pressing forward to be in time for the spectacle, which they

thought would have taken place in the early morning in honour of the rising sun, after the manner of the Brahmins. Some went on to secure a relic (λείψανον); others returned, and eagerly inquired of him what had happened. To the more intelligent of these inquirers Lucian told the truth; but for the simple souls that stood open-mouthed to hear the tale, he added, he says, sundry embellishments of his own. For their benefit he introduced an earthquake, and made a vulture fly up from the midst of the flames. He amused himself mightily at the horror which they displayed, and at the way in which some of them quietly adopted his inventions, and spoke of them as facts within their own knowledge. He adds that Proteus had before his death sent letters to divers cities of repute, and commissioned some of his associates to act as messengers from the shades below, and that he was sure that the cities which had been so honoured would erect statues to his memory.

Such, he says, was the end of the ill-fated Proteus, who had lived only for fame, the enjoyment of which he reaped by the very death which gave it to him.

To make Chronius, to whom he was writing, laugh the more, Lucian adds something further. He reminds his friend of what he (Lucian) had once told him of a voyage from Troas, in which he had been privileged to have Proteus as his companion, when Proteus showed his luxurious sensual habits, and also his miserable cowardice, in that when the storm overtook them this fine fellow went below and blubbered with the women. About nine days before his death, Lucian says, Proteus having over-eaten himself, and made himself very sick, fell ill of a fever. Alexander, the physician, was sent for, who found him, consumed with fever, rolling on the floor in agony, and asking for a little cold water. The physician refused the request. He reminded Proteus that he had desired death, and told him that death had now come of its own accord to his door, and that there was now no necessity for the fire. Proteus replied that such a death was much too common for him. Lucian had this story from Alexander; but he says that he himself saw Proteus only a few days before his death rubbing some ointment on his eyes till they watered again. It was, he says, as if a man who was

going to the cross should trouble himself about an ailment to his finger. Laugh, my friend, he adds, and most of all laugh at those who admire Proteus.

Such is Lucian's account of the life and death of Proteus Peregrinus. How much of it is true? When he tells us that he embellished the story for the benefit of some persons who, he thought, would believe him, one cannot help suspecting that there is more of satire than meets the eye; and that, though there may be some small modicum of truth, we may believe as much or as little of the general narrative as we please. At any rate, the conclusion of the account is hardly consistent with the beginning, where Lucian says distinctly that he was passing the gymnasium at Elis when he happened to hear of Proteus' purpose. Besides, there runs throughout the narrative a spirit of raillery and jest which we have vainly endeavoured to give in our brief paraphrase, and which seems to forbid us to look at the story in any other light than one of those jests of which Lucian was unquestionably fond.

§ 2. It must be confessed, however, that Lucian's account of Peregrinus has not commonly been regarded with this suspicion. Pearson, for example, in his celebrated *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, makes considerable use of *De Morte Peregrini*. He thinks that Peregrinus was acquainted with Ignatius' Epistles, and imitated them. He refers to *Peregrin.* 41. Lucian writes thus: εἰκόνας μὲν γὰρ παρά τε Ἑλλείων αὐτῶν, παρά τε τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων, οἷς καὶ ἐπεσταλκῆναι ἔλεγον, αὐτίκα μάλα οἶδα πολλὰς ἀναστησομένας. φασὶ δὲ πάσαις σχεδὸν ταῖς ἐνδόξοις πόλεσιν ἐπιστολὰς διαπέμψαι αὐτόν, διαθήκας τινάς, καὶ παραινέσεις, καὶ νόμους. καὶ τινὰς ἐπὶ τούτῳ (τούτων, v.l.) πρεσβευτὰς τῶν ἐταίρων ἐχειροτόνησε, νεκραγγέλους καὶ νερτεροδρόμους προσαγορεύσας. We must bring to the recollection of our readers the coincidence for this passage which we gave out of Philo a little while ago: ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἐξέπεμπε τῶν ἐταίρων τινάς, with ἐχειροτονοῦντο and διηγούμενος a few lines below. Pearson writes—

“Habemus hic epistolas a jamjam morituro ad insigniores civitates missas, cum exhortationibus: quod fecit S. Ignatius, neque ante Peregrinum præter eum, opinor, quisquam: habemus viros ex sociis suis institutos tanquam legatos: scilicet, ἐχειροτόνησε πρεσβευτάς, plane ut apud Ignatium nostrum epistola ad Smyrnæos (§ 11),

χειροτονῆσαι θεοπρεσβευτήν, et ad Magnesianos (? *Philad.* 10), χειροτονῆσαι διάκονον εἰς τὸ πρεσβεῦσαι ἐκείῳ Θεοῦ πρεσβείαν· habemus eos legatos a Peregrino appellatos νερτεροδρόμους, ut apud Ignatium (*Polyc.* 7), χειροτονῆσαι τινα, ὃς δυνήσεται θεοδρόμος καλεῖσθαι. Si huic conjecturae locus sit, has epistolas quas defendimus probe novit Peregrinus, qui ante martyrium Ignatii natus, post medium sæculi secundi flammis se dedit," *Pars.* i. 2, p. 79 (Migne).

Bishop Pearson was evidently too much in earnest to be able to detect a joke, or he would hardly have gravely supposed that Peregrinus adopted the title νερτεροδρόμους for his messengers. The joke is Lucian's, not Peregrinus'. This makes no difference, of course, to the argument in favour of Ignatius' Epistles, for Lucian was contemporary with Peregrinus. The bishop does not inquire whether Lucian really wrote *De Mort. Peregr.*, a question, in any case, of primary importance to the argument.

That the joke, or parody, is Lucian's, seems not at all doubtful. Ignatius, very soon after the words quoted above by Pearson from *Polyc.* 7, writes in the beginning of § 8: ἐπεὶ πάσαις ταῖς (note with the passage from *Peregrin.* 41 given above), ἐκκλησίαις οὐκ ἡδυνήθην γράψαι διὰ τὸ ἐξαίφνης πλεῖν με ἀπὸ Τρωάδος εἰς Νεάπολιν. But Lucian, almost immediately after the words quoted above, says: ἐκεῖνα μὲν γὰρ πάλαι οἶσθα εὐθύς ἀκούσας μου, ὅτε ἦκον ἀπὸ Συρίας, διηγούμενου (Philo's word), ὡς ἀπὸ Τρωάδος συμπλεύσαιμι αὐτῷ. Ignatius, almost immediately after the words quoted by Pearson out of *Philad.* 10, writes in § 11: περὶ δὲ Φίλωνος . . . ὃς ἀπὸ Συρίας μοι ἀκολουθεῖ, ἀποταξάμενος τῷ βίῳ (Lucian's companion was the very opposite of Ignatius'). It is, of course, not impossible that Lucian might have had Peregrinus as his companion in a voyage from Troas; nor is it impossible that Lucian might have given an account of this voyage in the body of his narrative in entire independence of what Ignatius had said. But it is inconceivable that he should finish his narrative of Peregrinus with the coincidences with Ignatius, which have been pointed out, and then tack on his account of the voyage from Troas as an afterthought (which it is), without having had that voyage suggested to his mind by the words of Ignatius: πλεῖν με ἀπὸ τῆς Τρωάδος.

Jacobson, on Ignat. *Polyc.* 7, says: "Luciani narrationem,

mirifice sane cum iis quæ in Epistolis nostris leguntur convenientem, non veram esse historiam arbitratur Deusterdieckius, sed Actorum Ignatii parodiam acerbam, *e.g.*, § 41, Φασὶ δὲ πάσαις, κ.τ.λ." Düsterdieck is certainly right. Lucian having come nearly to the end of his narrative, works up the conclusion as a parody upon the close of Ignatius' Epistle. His eye falls upon the mention of the voyage from Troas. He immediately invents a voyage with Peregrinus, and tacks it on at the end of his narrative. Ignatius' words would remind any one of S. Paul's voyage from Troas to Neapolis, Acts xvi. 11 (perhaps from this chapter comes the use of δεσμοφύλαξ in *Peregrin.* 12); S. Paul had another voyage, however, with a storm, and which is followed in Acts xxviii. 8, 9 by the story of Publius' father being sick of a fever (πυρετός); so Lucian adds a storm to his voyage, and directly afterwards makes Peregrinus to be ill, πυρετῷ μάλ' α σφοδρῷ. We shall hereafter find this fever appearing again and again in other quarters.

One more interesting coincidence, with the passage from *Perigrin.* 41 (quoted above), must be added. In *Phot. Bibl.* 126, we find: λέγει δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῖς Ἰγνατίου τοῦ θεοφόρου ἀπεσταλκέναι. Photius has just given a description of Clement's Epistles. We shall produce hereafter other coincidences with Photius, cod. 126, out of *Peregrinus* (see c. vi.).

From what has been just pointed out, it appears that *Peregrinus* contains some imitations or parodies of grave subjects, and that the coinage of new words was suggested to its writer by the language of Ignatius. Pearson has pointed out coincidences which, he thinks, cannot be accidental. If we accept these, we must accept also the others which we have supplied; and if we do, we shall naturally suspect the soundness of the judgment which has ascribed *De Morte Peregr.* to the pen of Lucian.

It will be well to examine some other accounts of *Peregrinus Proteus*. It may be that we shall find there something to justify this suspicion.

§ 3. Eusebius, *Chron.* ii. p. 562 (Migne), on Olympiad, 236, A.D. 166, writes: "Apud Pisas Peregrinus philosophus rogo, quem ex lignis composuerat, incenso, semet superjecit.

Περεγρίνος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐν πανηγύρει πῦρ ἀνάψας ἑαυτὸν ἐνέπρησε." In col. 555, an Agathobulus is mentioned, of whom nothing is known, and who may have been the equally unknown Agathobulus to whom, as we have seen, Peregrinus betook himself. Tertullian, *ad Mart.* 4, p. 625 (Migne), writes: "Heraclitus, qui se bubulo stercore oblitum exussit; item Empedocles, qui in ignes Ætnæi montis dissitivit; et Peregrinus, qui non olim se rogo immisit; cum fœminæ quoque contempserint ignes." Lucian also connects Empedocles and Heraclitus with Peregrinus, as we have already seen, and in § 23 he writes: καταφρονεῖν θανάτου καὶ καύσεως καὶ τῶν τοιούτων δειμάτων. In c. 1, Tertullian says: "Inter carnis alimenta—quæ—et singuli fratres de opibus suis propriis in carcerem subministrant." Compare with the behaviour of the Christians to Proteus when in prison. Heraclitus daubed himself with dung, Lucian's Peregrinus with mud. Peregrinus did this, and also beat himself in the presence of a large company. Tertullian goes on to speak of the διαμαστίγωσις of the Lacedæmonians when their youths were beaten in the presence of their parents and relatives. These things are wholly consistent with the notion that the writer of *Peregrinus* referred to Tertullian for information. In *Amm. Marcell.* xxix. 1, Peregrinus Proteus is mentioned. We learn, however, nothing more than Eusebius tells us.

In *Aul. Gell.* xii. 11, again Peregrinus is spoken of. From what we are there told, we should conclude that Peregrinus was not at all the kind of man whom Lucian describes, and the notion that Lucian's account is fictitious is thereby confirmed.

In *Peregrin.* 19, the writer says that Proteus went to Elis, and there κακῶς ἡγόρευεν Herodes Atticus, who had done so much for the comfort of the spectators at the Olympic games. Philostratus (*Vit. Soph.* ii. 13), in his life of Herodes, returns the allusion which the writer of *Peregrinus* makes to Herodes by a similar one to Proteus. He says: ἀλλ' ὅπως γε καὶ πρὸς τὰς λοιδορίας ἔρρωτο, δηλώσει καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὸν κύνα Πρωτεῖα λεχθέντα ποτὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Ἀθήνησιν. ἦν μὲν γὰρ τῶν οὕτω θαρραλέως φιλοσοφούντων ὁ Πρωτεύς οὗτος, ὡς ἐς πῦρ ἑαυτὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ῥίψαι. ἐπηκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἡρώδῃ, κακῶς ἀγορευάν αὐτὸν ἡμιβαρβάρῳ γλώττῃ. Philostratus uses κακῶς ἀγορεύειν three times, and lays great stress upon the words.

It certainly looks as though the expression had been borrowed from Philostratus by the writer of *Peregrinus*. We shall have a good deal to say about Philostratus' life of Herodes hereafter.

Athenagoras (*Suppl.* 26) says that Proteus cast himself into the fire in the neighbourhood of Olympia. In no other respect does he corroborate Lucian's story. He does, however, in a very remarkable manner bear witness to the fulfilment of a prophecy on which Lucian ventured. Athenagoras writes: τοῦ τοίνυν ἄλλους μὲν εἶναι τοὺς ἐνεργοῦντας, ἐφ' ἑτέρων δὲ ἀνίστασθαι τὰς εἰκόνας, ἐκείνο μέγιστον τεκμήριον, Τρωὰς καὶ Πάριον ἢ μὲν — τὸ δὲ Πάριον Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Πρωτέως. Comp. ἀνίστασθαι τὰς εἰκόνας with the opening words of the passage from § 41, quoted on p. 34.

It would be unreasonable to contend that this is an accidental coincidence. Are we then to think that Athenagoras, in writing his apology, found it necessary to consult Lucian on a matter of common notoriety? or are we to suppose that he had been so struck by the fulfilment of Lucian's prophecy that he unconsciously recorded that fulfilment partly in the prophet's own words? It seems a simpler solution, and one more in accordance with what has already been observed, to believe that the writer of *Peregrinus* is here jocosely making Athenagoras in some sort a witness to his veracity.

Reference to such other accounts of Proteus as we possess thus shows that the diffuse narrative given in *De Morte Peregrini* is without any external support, and that there are not wanting indications that the writer of the treatise in question consulted these accounts.

We shall now continue our examination of *Peregrinus*, and at the same time bring into comparison with it the *Evangelium Thomæ* and other writings. We shall be led into some long digressions. This we cannot help.

CHAPTER V.

EVANGELIUM THOMÆ.

THE edition of the *Evangelia Apocrypha*, published by C. Tischendorf (Lips. 1852), contains twenty-two apocryphal writings—some in Greek, and some in Latin.

The first of these is the *Protevangelium Jacobi*. Tischendorf names a number of writers to whom an apocryphal writing by James was known, and concludes this to be the one known to them. He says: “Accedit quod in libri argumento nihil est quod ab ingenio sæculi secundi medii abhorreat,” *Proleg.* p. xiii.

The fifth and sixth of the apocryphal writings in Tischendorf's volume are the *Evangelium Thomæ*, A (pp. 134–149), and the *Evangelium Thomæ*, B (pp. 150–155). These are two versions of the same Gospel. We shall see reasons for believing that these were written by the same hand.

We have already come across this Gospel in chap. iii. 2, 4, p. 26, where we showed a coincidence with it in certain pages of Philo, which same pages furnished coincidences with other writings.

As it will be necessary to refer exceedingly often to the *Evang. Thom.*,¹ some detailed account of it will be useful.

The *Evang. Thom.* A has nineteen sections, the contents of which are shortly as follows:—

1.

Declaration of the authorship of Thomas. 3 lines.

2.

Jesus, being five years old, creates twelve sparrows, and by so doing breaks the Sabbath. 16 lines.

¹ The other Greek writings are : IX. *Gesta Pilati*, A ; X. *Gesta Pilati*, B ; XI. *Descensus Christi ad Inferos* ; XVII. *Anaphora Pilati*, A ; XVIII. *Anaphora Pilati*, B ; XIX. *Paradosis Pilati* ; XXI. *Narratio Iosephi Arimathiensis*.

3.

The son of Anna offends Jesus, and is withered up at His word. 11 lines.

4.

Another child offends Jesus, and dies. 9 lines.

5.

Joseph expostulates. 12 lines.

6.

Jesus is brought to Zacchæus that he may learn His letters. 21 lines.

7.

Discomfiture of Zacchæus. 21 lines.

8.

Some words of Jesus. 8 lines.

9.

Jesus is playing with some boys in an upper chamber. One of them falls down and is killed. Jesus leaps down and restores him to life. 12 lines.

10.

A young man is cutting wood with an axe, and injures his foot. He is healed. 8 lines.

11.

Jesus, being six years old, is sent by His mother to fetch water. The pitcher is broken by the way. He brings the water back in His garment. 7 lines.

12.

Miraculous growth of corn. 7 lines.

13.

Joseph is making a bedstead, and has one piece too short for his purpose. It is pulled out to the required length. 11 lines.

14.

Jesus is taken to another master. There is a disagreement, and the master dies. 15 lines.

15.

Jesus is taken to another master, a friend of Joseph's, who admires Him. In consideration of this, the preceding master is restored. 22 lines.

16.

James is bitten by a viper, and is healed. 7 lines.

17.

Jesus restores a child to life. 10 lines.

18.

He does the same for a man. 7 lines.

19.

Jesus, being twelve years old, is taken to the temple. (The narrative nearly corresponds to that in Holy Scripture.) 25 lines.

There are only eleven sections in *Evang. Thom.* B. §§ 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 in each version deal with the same subjects. Of the rest in B, § 2 corresponds with § 3 in A, § 3 with § 2, § 8 with § 9, § 9 with § 10, § 10 with § 11, § 11 with § 13.

Tischendorf shows (*Proleg.* xl. sq.) that an *Evang. Thom.* was known to the ancients. He points out some circumstances which might seem to cast a doubt upon the authenticity of our apocryphal Gospel. He gives, however, reasons for putting these circumstances on one side, and adds: "Denique similitudo inter Irenæi locum de Jesu ad discendum litteras magistro tradito, *Adv. Hæres.* i. 20, et locos eos quibus eadem fabula in nostris codicibus narratur, tanta est ut nos vetet Irenæi librum a nostro diversum putare," p. xlii. It is unnecessary to produce these passages. It is enough to say that the apocryphal Gospel, of which we speak, claims to be the *Evang. Thom.* known to the ancients.

If it is what it professes to be, it formerly belonged to a group of apocryphal writings forged, as Irenæus says, by the Marcosians, a sect of the Valentinians, with intent "to confound the foolish, and those who know not the scriptures of truth."¹ It is to be expected, therefore, that writings of this character should contain much that sounds unpleasantly in our

¹ See Westcott, *Can. New Test.* Pt. I. iv. 8, p. 305, 4th ed.

ears. Irenæus shows, however, that they were composed not for the sake of the jest or the blasphemy, as we should account it, but with a real, earnest purpose. They were intended as an attack upon Christianity, as then commonly received. Open jests and open blasphemies may be looked for, not parodies of verses of the Old Testament which may easily escape observation.

§ 1. To give our readers an idea of the true character of our *Evang. Thom.*, we shall point out a most obvious parody of a verse of the book of Proverbs—most obvious, that is, when once attention is called to it.

In *Evang. Thom.* B 10, p. 154, our Lord is sent to the fountain for water, and, having broken the pitcher on the way, He returns with the water in His garment.

The next section, on the same page, tells us that Joseph was engaged in making a bedstead, and found one of the pieces of wood too short for his purpose. Joseph was then directed to place them side by side, and to pull upon the shorter piece. He did so τότε κρατήσας καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸ ἕτερον ἄκρον εἴλκυσεν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἄλλην προτομήν.

Prov. xxx. 4 runs: τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ κατέβη; τίς συνήγαγεν ἀνέμους ἐν κόλπῳ; τίς συνέστρεψεν ὕδωρ ἐν ἱματίῳ; τίς ἐκράτησε πάντων τῶν ἄκρων τῆς γῆς;

It is not possible, one would suppose, that this resemblance of the *Evang. Thom.* B to this verse can be accidental. The second clause of this verse, we may remark, is quoted by Canon Lightfoot (*Ep. of Clem.* p. 192) in illustration of an apocryphal quotation in Clem. ii. 4.

We have some evidence at hand which is in some measure corroborative of the parody which we have pointed out.

In the narrative of the breaking of the pitcher, in *Evang. Thom.* B, the language (συνετρίβη ἡ ὕδρια αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἐν τῇ πηγῇ, κ.τ.λ.) resembles Eccles. xii. 6: καὶ συντριβὴ ὕδρια ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ. Solomon proceeds: καὶ συντροχάσῃ ὁ τροχὸς ἐπὶ τὸν λάκκον, καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ ὁ χοῦς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὥς ἦν, κ.τ.λ. The last words are, no doubt, a reference to—they would at any rate suggest—Gen. ii. 7: καὶ ἐπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, κ.τ.λ. In *Evang. Thom.* A 2, it is said: καὶ λαβὰν πηλὸν ἐπλασεν πουλία (στρουθία, just above) ἰβ. A little above, in the same section, it is said: τὰ ῥέοντα ὕδατα συνήγαγεν (exactly

in the verse of Proverbs) εἰς λάκκον (see above in Eccles.). In Eccles., in ver. 4, there is στρουθίου.

In the *Evang. Thom.* A, between the two miraculous circumstances which form the parody on the verse from Proverbs, a short section intervenes, which has nothing answering to it in B.

We are told (§ 12, p. 143) that at the seed-time (ἐν καιρῷ τοῦ σπόρου) the child went out with his father to sow (σπείρειν) corn in the field. He sowed one grain. When it was reaped (θερίζειν) and threshed it produced 100 measures. He then called together all the poor of the village, and gave (ἐχαρίσατο) to them.

This would be readily suggested by Eccles. xi. In ver. 2: "Give a portion to seven, and also to eight." In ver. 4: "He that observeth the wind shall not sow (σπείρει); and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap (θερίσει)."

Now turn to Eccles. x.

Ver. 9 runs: σχίζων ξύλα κινδυνεύσει ἐν αὐτοῖς· ἐὰν ἐκπέσῃ τὸ σιδήριον, κ.τ.λ.

We have been referring to *Evang. Thom.* A, §§ 11, 12, 13. In § 10 (B 9) we are informed that as a young man was σχίζων ξύλα, the axe fell (ἔπεσεν) and cut his foot so severely that he died. He was immediately healed (ἰάθη) by Jesus, and the people said: Of a truth the Spirit of the Lord (πνεῦμα Θεοῦ) dwelleth in this child. Ver. 4 of Eccles. runs: ἐὰν πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐξουσιάζοντος ἀνάβῃ ἐπὶ σέ, τόπον σου μὴ ἀφῆς, ὅτι ἵαμα καταπαύσει ἁμαρτίας μεγάλας.

Ver. 7 of Eccles. has: καθαιροῦντα φραγμὸν δῆξεται αὐτὸν ὄφεις; and ver. 11: ἐὰν δάκῃ ὄφεις. In *Evang. Thom.* A 16, James is sent δῆσαι ξύλα; a viper ἔδακε his hand. But Jesus κατεφύσησε τὸ δῆγμα, and healed him.

These coincidences, as a whole, cannot have accidentally arisen, and they show plainly how this apocryphal Gospel was manufactured.

If the writer of the *Evang. Thom.* used not only the LXX. version of Eccles. but also the *Metaphrasis* ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, the various points which he takes up would be much more distinctly marked out for him.

The *Metaphrasis* is very brief, not much longer indeed than the book of Ecclesiastes, which it paraphrases.

Thus in Eccles. *Metaph.* xi. 6 we find: σπείρας δὲ ἐν καιρῷ, συγχόμιζε τοὺς καρπούς, ὅπότ' ἂν τούτου καιρὸς ἐνστῇ; in ver. 9, χαρίζεσθαι ἐπιθυμίαις. Compare with what is given above out of the miracle of the corn (*Evang. Thom.* A 12).

In x. 8, 11, δῆγμα, compare with miracle of the snake-bite above.

In x. 9, 10, ἀλλὰ καὶ σχίζων ξύλα, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ οἰκειῷ ὅπλῳ τὸν κίνδυνον οἴσει· ἐὰν δὲ συμβῇ τοῦ στελεοῦ τὸν πέλεκυν ἐκπηδῆσαι, θορυβηθήσεται ὁ ταῦτα ἐργαζόμενος, κ.τ.λ. In Eccles. there is no mention of an axe. In *Evang. Thom.* B, πέλεκυς is the word; in A, ἀξίνη; and in the latter, θορύβου γενομένου is said. The words σχίζων ξύλα are in both versions.

We shall show presently that Gregory's *Metaphrasis* was used by certain other writers. The things now pointed out come very appropriately to hand. It is difficult to suppose them to be accidental. It is, however, a matter of very small importance whether we at present conclude that Gregory was or was not used by the writer of the *Evang. Thom.* At any rate, what has been pointed out shows that ideas and language similar to those of the *Evang. Thom.* would be naturally suggested by the perusal of the last three chapters of the book of Ecclesiastes, which is all that we contend for at present.

We do not think that the use of this book for suggestions can reasonably be denied. The ideas for the filling out of these suggestions, and the language in which they are clothed, come from various sources. These are partly classical, and some of them will be pointed out presently. Other sources, again, are scriptural. The story of the cure of the snake-bite in A 16, p. 147, for example, seems to point to Acts xxviii. 3 sq., where συστρέψαντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου φρυγάνων πλῆθος . . . ἔχιδνα . . . καθῆψε τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ . . . τὸ θηρίον may be compared with συλλέγοντος τοῦ Ἰακώβου τὰ φρύγανα ἔχιδνα ἔδακε τὴν χεῖρα Ἰακώβου . . . τὸ θηρίον of the *Evang. Thom.*

In *Peregrinus* 36 we find πυρὰν, and in the next line but one τῶν φρυγάνων, ὡς ἀναφθείη τάχιστα, and after a few lines, in § 37: ἀνῆψαν τὸ πῦρ μέγιστον, ἅτε ἀπὸ δάδων καὶ φρυγάνων. Compare ἀνάψαντες γὰρ πυρὰν . . . φρυγάνων πλῆθος, Acts xxviii. 2, 3. One would not care to point this out if it were not that we find in § 42 an account of a voyage and a storm at sea followed immediately by a fever, just as S. Paul's voyage and

shipwreck are followed in Acts xxviii. by the fever of Publius' father. See the paraphrase of *Peregrinus* in chap. iv.

§ 2. In *Peregrin.* 9, Lucian relates a very disgusting story concerning Proteus. The examination, however, of certain passages of Aristophanes and his scholiast, which illustrate and explain it, leads to such important results that we cannot afford to pass it by.

Lucian writes: τὸ γὰρ τῆς φύσεως τοῦτο πλάσμα καὶ δημιουργημα, ὁ τοῦ Πολυκλείτου κανὼν, ἐπεὶ εἰς ἄνδρας τελεῖν ἤρξατο ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ μοιχεύειν ἀλούς, μάλᾳ πολλὰς πληγὰς ἔλαβε, καὶ τέλος κατὰ τοῦ τέγους ἀλόμενος διέφυγε, ῥαφανίδι τὴν πυγὴν βεβυσμένος· εἶτα μειράκιόν τι ᾠραῖον διαφθείρας, τρισχιλίων ἐξωνήσατο παρὰ τῶν γονέων τοῦ παιδός, πενήταν ὄνταν, μὴ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀρμωστὴν ἀπαχθῆναι τῆς Ἀσίας, with κυβιστῶντες ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, only five lines above, and with τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ κεκραγὼς ἐκείνος ἐκαλεῖτο in § 5; ἔτι γὰρ τοῦτο ἐκαλεῖτο in § 12. This story and Lucian's ἐν τῷ μέσῳ remind us of St John viii. 1 sq., and καὶ κατελείφθη μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐν μέσῳ ἐστῶσα, ver. 9 in particular.

In *Evang. Thom.* A 9 (B 8), it is said that Jesus was playing with some boys, ἐν ὑπερώῳ, and that one of them, πεσὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ δώματος κάτω, died (cf. ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ . . . ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστέγου κάτω, καὶ ἦρθη νεκρός, Acts xx. 8, 9). When the other boys saw this they fled, καὶ κατέστη ὁ Ἰησοῦς μόνος (καὶ μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὑπελείφθη ἐστώς, B). The γονεῖς of the boy heard of it and came, and looking up they saw Jesus and reviled Him, κατεπήδησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ στέγου καὶ ἔστη παρὰ τὸ πτώμα τοῦ παιδίου, καὶ ἔκραξε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ εἶπεν Ζῆνον, . . . οὕτω γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκαλεῖτο. Jesus restored him to life, οἱ δὲ γονεῖς τοῦ παιδίου glorified God. Compare above.

Four lines above this story, in same p. 142, in the *Evang. Thom.* A, is ὡς τὸ παιδίον κατέπαυσε τὸν λόγον. Compare ὥστε κατέπαυσε τὸν λόγον, *Peregrin.* §§ 5, 33.

There are thus three sources to which the story of the *Evang. Thom.* would seem to be indebted. They mutually support one another; and the fact that S. John viii. might have been suggested by *Peregrinus*, must be observed.

There are four passages in Aristophanes which have more or less bearing upon the story in *Peregrinus* 9. Two of

them are, however, fairly close together, and practically form one.

1. *Nub.* 967 (Bekker): οὐδ' ἂν ἐλέσθαι δειπνοῦντ' ἐξῆν κεφάλαιον τῆς ῥαφανίδος.

In 958 we find τυπτόμενος πολλάς. As the scholiast says: πληγὰς δηλονότι. Compare with *Peregrinus* above. In 964 we find παῖς; in 981: γονέας. Cf. above. In 982 is τᾶγαλμα. Four lines above the story in *Peregrinus*, and also in the sentence following it, Proteus is called τὸ ἄγαλμα. In 987 (and elsewhere) is μεράκιον; in 1000: πυγὴν μεγάλην; in 1005: πυγὴν μικράν. Compare above, and also the plural εἰς τὰς πυγὰς in § 17. In 1012: ὦ καλλίπυργον σοφίαν κλεινοτάτην ἐπασκῶν. After six lines *Peregrinus* speaks of τὴν θαυμαστὴν σοφίαν of the Christians. In 1047 we notice ὁ κακοδαίμων, the first words of *Peregrinus*. In 1057: τῆς φύσεως, followed in 1062 by μοιχρὸς γὰρ ἦν τύχης ἀλούς. Compare above.

This brings us in 1066 to the second passage, illustrative of *Peregrin.* 9: τί δ', ἢ ῥαφανιδωθῇ πιθόμενός σοι, τέφρα τε τιλθῇ;

In 1071 is τί δ' ἄλλο. Just before the story in *Peregrinus* is τί γὰρ ἄλλο. In 1085: ὦ κινούμενοι, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, δέξασθέ μου θοιμάτιον, ὡς ἐξαυτομολῶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς; and in 1106: προσεχέτω τὸν νοῦν. Compare ὁ δέ, καὶ μοι πάνυ ἤδη πρόσσεχε τὸν νοῦν, ἀποθήμενος τὴν πῆραν, καὶ τὸ τριβάνιον; and after three lines, δαίμονες . . . δέξασθέ με, § 36. In 1110 we find τοῦ τέγους used above.

With the words from 1055 compare ποῖος δὲ κόσμος δέξεταιί τινα τῶν αὐτομολούντων ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, *Clem.* i. 28.

2. There are two passages in *Plutus* which have to do with *Peregrin.* 9, but at some distance from one another. For the sake of convenience we shall take the second passage first.

(1.) In *Plut.* 544, Aristophanes says: ἀντὶ δὲ μάζης φυλλεῖ ἰσχυῶν ῥαφανίδαν. It is the word ῥαφανίς and its use which takes our writer from passage to passage. The word will turn up again in another quarter.

Perhaps φυλλεῖ ἰσχυῶν attracted some notice. Suidas quotes *Acharn.* 445, where the same combination is used. In *Acharn.* 439 is βεβυσμένον. Compare ῥαφανίδι τὴν πυγὴν βεβυσμένον in *Peregrin.* 9, quoted above. Two passages are thus combined.

In *Acharn.* 488: τί ταῦτα τοὺς Λάκωνας αἰτιώμεθα may be compared with τὸν οὖν Θεαγένῃ τοῦτο μάλιστα αἰτιάσαιτο, *Peregrin.* 24. Observe the double accusative. This line of Aristophanes is noticeable as being quoted by Aristeides. We shall refer there hereafter, and it will then be seen that *Peregrin.* §§ 9, 24 are closely connected.

Returning to *Plut.* 544, we find in 547: ἀγαθὼν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀποφαίνω σ' αἴτιον οὔσαν; Compare παῖδας αὐτοὺς ἀπέφηνε . . . καὶ πάντα μόνος αὐτὸς ὢν, presently in *Peregrin.* 11. We shall refer to this again directly.

In 554 we notice ἐπιλείπειν. ὡς μακαρίτην ᾧ Δάματερ with καταλειψεί in 555. Compare ἣν ὁ μακαρίτης πατὴρ αὐτῷ κατέλιπε, *Peregrin.* 15. Examination will show how the one passage is worked up out of the other. The scholiast would assist our author.

In 586 is στεφανώσας κοτινῷ στεφάνῳ. Compare κοτίνῳ τὲ ἐστεμμένον, *Peregrin.* 40.

(2.) The other and the most important¹ passage of Aristophanes is in *Plut.* 168: ὁ δ' ἀλόους γε μοιχρὸς διὰ σέ που παρατίλλεται. The scholiast here fully describes the punishment of the adulterer. Among his words are: τὰς τρίχας τίλλεται. Compare τὰς τρίχας ἐτίλλετο, *Peregrin.* 6.

In 140 is ἀνήσεται; in 150, πένης. Compare above.

In 181 sq. Aristophanes writes—

XPE. τὰ δὲ πράγματ' οὐχὶ διὰ σέ πάντα πράττεται;
μονώτατος γὰρ εἶ σὺ πάντων αἴτιος,
καὶ τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, εὖ ἴσθ' ὅτι.

KA. κρατοῦσι γοῦν κἂν τοῖς πολέμοις ἐκάστοτε,
ἐφ' οἷς ἂν οὗτος ἐπικαθέζηται μόνος.

ΠΛΟΥ. ἐγὼ τοσαῦτα δυνατός εἰμ' εἰς ὧν ποεῖν;

Lucian goes on in § 10: ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔασειν μοι δοκῶ πηλὸς γὰρ ἔτι ἄπλαστος ἦν, καὶ οὐδέπω ἐντελὲς ἄγαλμα ἡμῶν ἐνδεδημιούργητο. ἃ δὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔδρασε, καὶ πάνυ ἀκοῦσαι ἄξιον. . . . εἶτα ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα διεβεβόητο, φυγὴν ἑαυτοῦ καταδικάσας ἐπλανᾶτο, ἄλλην ἄλλοτε ἄμειβων. § 11: ὅτεπερ καὶ τὴν θαυμαστὴν σοφίαν τῶν χριστιανῶν ἐξέμαθε, περὶ τὴν Παλαιστίνην τοῖς ἱερέυσιν καὶ γραμματεῦσιν αὐτῶν συγγενόμενος. καὶ (τί γάρ;) ἐν βραχεὶ παῖδας αὐτοὺς ἀπέφηνε, προφήτης, καὶ θιασάρχης, καὶ ξυναγωγεὺς, καὶ πάντα μόνος αὐτὸς ὢν. καὶ τῶν βίβλων τὰς μὲν

¹ See chap. vi.

ἔξηγεῖτο, καὶ διεσάφει, πολλὰς δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ξυνέγραφε, καὶ ὡς θεὸν αὐτὸν ἐκείνοι ἡγοῦντο, καὶ νομοθέτη ἐχρῶντο, καὶ προστάτην ἐπέγραφον. τὸν μέγαν γοῦν ἐκείνον ἔτι σέβουσιν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ ἀνασκολοπισθέντα, ὅτι καινὴν ταύτην τελετὴν εἰσήγαγεν ἐς τὸν βίον.

Compare the καὶ πάντα μόνος αὐτὸς ὢν with Aristophanes. The poet's εἷς ὢν hardly makes necessary, though it would suggest, Hesychius' explanation of μονώτατος by μόνος ὢν, ὑπάρχων. We had occasion to refer just now (see p. 47) to *Plut.* 544 in illustration of *Peregrin.* 9; and in 546 sq. we found: ἄρά γε πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀποφαίνω σ' αἴτιον οὔσαν; Comp. Lucian's ἀπέφηνε, and the lines of Aristophanes given above.

The scholiast on μονώτατος refers to Lysurgus' *Contr. Leocr.* 20. He only gives a few words. If he had been illustrating *Peregrinus*, he would doubtless have given the whole sentence, which is this: τοιγαροῦν μονώτατοι ἐπ' ἀννυμοὶ τῆς χώρας εἰσὶν, ἰσοθέων τιμῶν τετυχηκότες. Comp. Lucian's ὡς θεὸν . . . ἡγοῦντο, applied to Proteus.

The editors have found some difficulty in dealing with the sentence beginning with τὸν μέγαν γοῦν. It has been contended that this last word should be altered into γάρ. Reference to the lines of Aristophanes above shows that there is a γοῦν in 184. A difficulty has been felt there also; and there also γάρ has been suggested.

The τὸν μέγαν, again, has been a difficulty. A lacuna after ἐπέγραφον has been supposed by some. Gessner conjectured μάγον. There is, however, in Aristophanes, in 170, an important μέγας. He says: μέγας δὲ βασιλεὺς οὐχὶ διὰ τοῦτον κομᾷ; We have no doubt at all that μέγαν was written. We shall presently find it taken up in Clement as τὸν (μέγαν) ἀρχιερέα, and in some other quarters as τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα (see cc. vi. vii.).

We believe that the passage was intentionally written as it stands, that it might be thought to be corrupt, and that it might give rise to comment and conjecture; for while we are satisfied that μέγαν was written, we are equally satisfied that μάγον, which is an obvious conjectural emendation, was in the mind of the writer.

(α) In chap. iii. 1, 4, it was shown that Cyril of Jerusalem and

Clement agree in applying the epithet ἀγαθοί to S. Peter and S. Paul. Both writers agree in using the word προστάτης. Cyril calls the apostles οἱ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας προστάται, *Cat.* vi. 15, p. 96. Cyril goes on: καὶ ἐπιδεικτιῶντα τὸν νομιζόμενον θεὸν Σίμωνα, νεκρὸν εὐθὺς ἀπέδειξαν. Presently Cyril says: καὶ οὐ θαύματος ἄξιον Παῦλος γὰρ ἦν: “who was caught up into the third heaven and into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.” Comp. Lucian’s προστάτην κ.τ.λ., and his καὶ πάνυ ἀκοῦσαι ἄξιον a little above. As the reading stands as above with μέγαν, the coincidence now pointed out is noticeable. Write in μάγον, however, and it becomes remarkable, for Simon is here called Μάγος. We shall confirm the idea of the use of Cyril directly. Meanwhile we must remember that we referred to Cyril merely because of the connection between him and Clement.

(β) If the writer of *Peregrinus*, though writing μέγαν in § 11, had μάγον in his mind, as has been suggested on p. 48, it may be worth while to turn to Epiphanius, who, in his *Adversus Hæreses*, discourses on Simon Magus and the other heretics of whom Cyril speaks. There can be no other reason for hoping to find in that particular part of Epiphanius’ writings coincidences with *Peregrin.* 11 and thereabouts.

In *Hæres.* xxi., Simon is discussed; in xxii., Menander, who followed in Simon’s steps; in xxiii., Saturnilus and his connection with Simon. We may pause on § 4 for a moment. Epiphanius is speaking of the heretical notion that man was created by angels. The word πλάσμα occurs, and very soon μαῦλλον ἐντελέστερον τὸ ἔργον τοῦ τεχνίτου. Comp. Lucian’s πλάσμα in § 9, and his πηλὸς γὰρ ἄπλαστος ἦν, καὶ οὐδέπω ἐντελὲς ἄγαλμα (Proteus) in § 10, quoted p. 47.

In *Hæres.* xxiv., Epiphanius speaks of the heresy of Basilides, an offshoot from Saturnilus and Simon. In § 3, p. 71, he says that these heretics contended that it was not Jesus, but Simon the Cyrenian, who was crucified (ἐσταυρώθη); Jesus ascended up into heaven παραδούς τὸν Σίμωνα ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι. Comp. with Lucian in § 11 (see p. 48). In § 13, Lucian says: ἔπειτα δὲ ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ πρῶτος ἔπεισεν αὐτούς, ὡς θεοὺς μὲν τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς ἀπαρνῆσθαι, τὸν δὲ ἀνέσκολοπισμένον¹ ἐκείνον

¹ With ἀνασκολοπισθῆντα ἔτι καινὴν κ.τ.λ., *Peregrin.* 11, comp. ἀνέσκολόπισι τὴν ἀρχαίην δίκην ἐπιτιμῶν, Herod. iv. 43. “Citat Thomas M. in Ἐπίτιμος,” Gaisford.

σοφιστήν αὐτῶν προσκυνᾶσι. Epiphanius writes on the same page : τοὺς αὐτῷ πεισθέντας ἐκδιδάσκει, and presently : ἀπαρνησιθεῖαν αὐτὰς ἐκδιδάσκων. The word ἀπαρνησιθεῖα is very uncommon, and therefore likely to have attracted attention. We shall have occasion presently to refer again to these same pages of Epiphanius.

(γ) We have been, however, only preparing the way for some more conclusive evidence.

In the *Oratio ad Græcos* (ascribed in the ms. to Justin Martyr), § 3, it is said: τὰ μὲν Ἀτρέως ἄγη, Θυέστου λέχη, καὶ Πελοπιδῶν μύση, καὶ Δαναὸν φθόνῳ φονεύοντα, καὶ ἀτεκνοῦντα μεμεθυσμένον, καὶ τὰ Θυέστεια δεῖπνα ἃ Ἐριννύες ἥρτυον, with τὰ γὰρ Οἰδίποδος κ.π.λ. in the next line. The words here seem to be carefully selected. Observing this, we turned to certain so-called excerpts from Helladius, the Egyptian grammarian, found in Photius, *Bibl.* 279. These excerpts are frequently used in Stephens' *Thesaurus* sometimes with, but oftener without acknowledgment. On p. 535 we found διὸ καὶ . . . ἐκάλουν . . . τὰς δὲ Ἐριννύας Εὐμενίδας ἢ σεμνὰς θεάς, τὸ δὲ μύσος ἄγος. We further remarked in the excerpts various things which might have been used as hints in the composition of the *Oration*; and as Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 1, p. 156, writes: τὰ Θυέστεια δεῖπνα καὶ Οἰδιποδείους μίξεις (comp. with *Oration* above), we thought it probable that the whole passage in the *Oration* was a mere manufacture, and that the Helladian excerpts had been used.

Knowing all the writings with which we deal to be closely connected together in the sources from which they are drawn, we have carefully kept these excerpts in view. When, then, we came upon *μονώτατος* in Aristophanes, and when it appeared probable that the writer of *Peregrinus* had been struck by the word, we turned with some interest to Helladius, who comments upon it.

On p. 533 the writer of the excerpt says: ὅτι τὸ μόνος ἐπίτασίν φασι μὴ λαμβάνειν οἱ γραμματικοί διὸ τὸ μονώτατος σόλοικον ἡγοῦνται. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὅμως κέχρηται τῇ φωνῇ. Helladius refers to *Plut.* 182 (not to *Eq.* 352, where the word is also found), as we shall see presently, to the very passage, *i.e.* now in hand. In the preceding twenty-four lines we remark: νομοθέτην, οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, γράφειν, τὸν τῶν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ καταδικασθέντων φονέα, Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ τοῦ περιπάτου προστάτης.

Comp. here the *καταδικάσας* (for murder), *θαυμαστήν, καὶ πάντα μόνος αὐτὸς ὢν, ξυνέγραφε, ἡγοῦντο καὶ νομοθέτη ἐχρῶντο καὶ προστάτην ἐπέγραφον* of *Peregrin.* 11, quoted pp. 47, 48.

At the close Photius speaks of other books written by Helladius (*συγγραφεύς*), an Egyptian *ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπιγράφει*, adding: *ιαμβικῶ δὲ μέτρῳ διεξῆλθε τὰ προκείμενα. Ἐπιγράφειν* becomes connected with *προστάτης* through *Arist. Pac.* 667: *ὅτι αὐτῷ πονηρὸν προστάτην ἐπεγράψατο*. In chap. vi. the use of this place of Aristophanes will be shown.

It is simply impossible that the coincidences which have now been pointed out can have accidentally arisen. Let us consider how the case stands.

Peregrin. 9 contains a story for the explanation of which it is necessary to examine certain passages of Aristophanes, and in particular *Plut.* 168, and the scholiast's remarks thereon. We did so, and found some indications of the use of Aristophanes in *Peregrin.* 9. We remarked further that the writer of *Peregrinus* had apparently been struck by Aristophanes' use of the word *μονώτατος* in *Plut.* 182, for in his § 11 there was shown not only a resemblance to *Plut.* 182, but also to the words of Lysurgus, to which the scholiast refers in illustration of that line. In consequence of this seeming interest in *μονώτατος* by the author of *Peregrinus*, we turned to a certain specified page of Photius' *Bibliotheca* (the excerpts from Helladius). We had no reason to expect coincidences there. There is no identity in thought between that page and *Peregrin.* 11 to lead to identity in language. Nothing, indeed, can be more broken than the thread of ideas in the excerpts from Helladius. The passage just now referred to contains about twenty-five lines distributed in seven exceedingly short excerpts, each of which has a distinct subject. We had no more right to expect to find anything common to that page with *Peregrin.* 11 than in any other of the 545 pages of the *Bibliotheca*. Yet in that page, in close company with *μονώτατος*, which Aristophanes, not the writer of *Peregrinus*, uses, we found very noticeable coincidences.

It must be remembered that this is now the ninth instance of what looks like indebtedness on the part of the writer of *Peregrinus* to other writers. He seems to use Philo, Ignatius, Photius, *Bibl.* 126, Tertullian, Athenagoras, to use (or to be used by) the *Evang. Thom.*, Aristophanes, Epiphanius. Now he

is tracked in a way that cannot surely be accidental into the excerpts from Helladius. The conclusion is irresistible. If these excerpts are genuine, they were used by the writer of *Peregrinus*. The writer cannot then be Lucian. If the excerpts are not genuine, the case is not materially altered. The word *μονώτατος* in Aristophanes might guide the writer of *Peregrinus* to the excerpts, but it could not guide the writer of the excerpts to *Peregrin.* 11, for the word is not there used. If, however, these excerpts are frauds, the connection between them and *Peregrinus* may be much closer than as yet appears. For the present, we must conclude only that *Peregrinus* and the *Bibliotheca* are not independent of one another.

The conclusion at which we have now arrived, it must be remarked, gives a general justification to the supposition that the writers just named were used in *Peregrinus*, and in particular that Aristophanes was made use of very much in the way that has been pointed out above. We must further infer that the writer of *Peregrinus* was fond of jest and parody, and a man who took a lively and scholarly interest in words.

We ought now to proceed to bring the *Evangelium Thomæ* into comparison with those passages of Aristophanes which were used in *Peregrin.* 9, for this section has been shown to be in close contact with the *Evang. Thom.* We must, however, for the sake of confirming the conclusion to which we have just come, and of clearing the way for future discussion, enter upon one of those digressions as to which we warned our readers on p. 38, and consider the question of the genuineness or otherwise of the excerpts which we have just been using.

(δ) These excerpts, as we have called them, are short summaries of matters found in the four books of Helladius. They are not in the words of the grammarian, who wrote in iambics. Photius introduces every fresh subject with ὅτι. In a passage of forty-five lines, and which includes that to which we just now called attention, this ὅτι occurs ten times, showing that there are ten different subjects. One or two of these lead us to suppose—as they were no doubt intended to do—that they are summaries of matters treated at some length by Helladius himself. This passage occupies about one column out of the eleven devoted to the four books of Helladius in Migne's edition. It is evident, therefore, that

we have no right to expect to find more points of contact with Aristophanes' *Plutus* in the near neighbourhood of *μονώτατος* (*Plut.* 182) than the excerpt given on p. 50 contains, which stands number eight in the passage with which we are now concerned.

In *Plut.* 191, however, Aristophanes speaks of *ισχάδων*. In Excerpt 10 we are told that it was customary at Athens, in certain expiations, to wear black *ισχάδας* round the neck on behalf of men, and white on behalf of women.

In 179, *Lais* the courtesan is mentioned. There is a scholion on her; and the language describing her murder in the temple of Venus, and the consequences of the murder, is almost exactly that of Helladius in Excerpt 9.

Excerpt 8 is on *μονώτατος*.

In 175 is *βελονόπαλης*. In Excerpt 1 it is said: *ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς βελόνης ἡ ῥαφὶς παλαιότερον*. Stephens says that *ῥαφίς* has sometimes the meaning of "napus," and he gives the word with this meaning under *ῥαφανίς*. We cannot forget that it has been the unpleasant story in *Peregrin.* 9 of the *ῥαφανίς* that brought us to *Plut.* 168 and the scholion thereon. The punishment of the adulterer is referred to in an earlier excerpt.¹

Excerpt 2 runs thus: *ὅτι, φησὶν οὗτος, Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ τοῦ περιπάτου προστάτης ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος ἵππος ἐπωνομάζετο, ἐναν-*

¹ P. 530 : *ὅτι ὁ στίχος ὁ καὶ παροιμιαζόμενος·*

ὄρκους ἐγὼ γυναικὸς εἰς ὕδωρ γράφω,

ἔστι μὲν Σοφοκλείους, τοῦτον δὲ παραδήσας ὁ Φιλωνίδης ἔφη·

ὄρκους δὲ μοιχῶν εἰς τέφραν ἐγὼ γράφω.

Οἱ δὲ τὰς γυναικάς σκώπτωντές φασιν·

ὄρκους ἐγὼ γυναικῶν εἰς οἶκτον γράφω.

Comp. with this last : *ὁ δ', ὡς ἀνὴρ γενναῖος, οὐκ οἴκτου μέτα κατήνεσεν τὰ δ' ὄρκιος δράσειν ξένω*, *Soph. O. C.* 1636. Athenæus (quoting Xenarchus) writes : *ὄρκον δ' ἐγὼ γυναικὸς εἰς οἶνον γράφω*, x. p. 441. This is perhaps the original. The grouping of the lines in the excerpt has an amusing resemblance to Stephens' parodies, described on p. 16. In *Plut.* 179 a Philonides is mentioned as well as *Lais* (so also by the scholiast). The punishment at which Philonides glances is fully described by the scholiast on *Plut.* 168. There is no authority whatever for attributing the first of the lines just given to Sophocles. The expression *ἔνυδατι γράφειν* is used by Plato, *Phædr.* p. 276. Above it and below it we observe *παιδιᾶς χάριν*. It happens that the scholiast on *Plut.* 179 refers to the *Phædrus*; and in his first sentence about Philonides uses the expression *παιδιᾶς ἔνεκεν*. In an inquiry such as this is in which we are engaged, it is necessary to take note of every little circumstance. A straw will sometimes show which way the stream is moving.

τιοῦσθαι δοκῶν τῷ διδασκάλῳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἵππος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φιλεῖ πατέρα δάκνειν. In *Plut.* 155 sq. Aristophanes jests about a horse. The χρηστοὶ παῖδες, he says, do not ask for money as the wages of their iniquity: ὁ μὲν ἵππον ἀγαθόν, ὁ δὲ κύνας θηρευτικός. αἰσχυρόμενοι γὰρ ἀργύριον αἰτεῖν ἴσως ὀνόματι περιπέττουσι τὴν μοχθηρίαν. The scholiast says that under the name of the horse they conceal their desire for money.

Aristophanes' epithet χρηστοί is noticeable. In *Plut.* 386 he has: ἀλλὰ τοὺς χρηστοὺς μόνους ἔγωγε καὶ τοὺς δεξιούς κ.τ.λ. On δεξιός it may be that the writer of the excerpts consulted or remembered Suidas, who gives the proverb beginning δεξιὸν εἰς ὑπόδημα κ.τ.λ., for in the very next excerpt (of three lines) this proverb is given. Curiously, also, Hesychius writes: χρηστοί, οἱ καταδικασμένοι, χρήσιμοι. The next excerpt (4) to the proverb runs: ὅτι δήμιον μὲν φησι καλεῖσθαι τὸν τῶν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ καταδικασθέντων φονέα, δημόκοινον δὲ τὸν βασανιστήν. This appears to be taken from the *Etymologicum Magnum*. Δημόκοινος· δημόσιος βασανιστής· ἢ ὁ δήμιος, ἡγουν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ δήμου τὸ φονεύειν κληρωθείς, p. 265, F. Sylb. 1593. The words τὸν τῶν ἐπὶ θαν. κατ. φον., which form part of the coincidence with *Peregrinus*, are, however, interpolated, being suggested apparently by Hesychius.

These things come very appropriately to hand just when they are wanted. Can it possibly be all accident? If not, this can hardly be the work of Helladius. Helladius, moreover, did not write the excerpts, but four books of iambs from which they are compiled. To all appearance, the excerpts themselves have been manufactured from hints supplied by Aristophanes and his scholiast.

The application of the term "horse" to Aristotle looks very much like mere jesting. He is in the same place also called προστάτης. On this account, but on no other, it is natural to turn to Cyril of Jerusalem, whose use of the word has seemed to be so interesting in some other quarters. Nothing can easily be conceived more unlikely than that coincidences with a specified page of Helladius should be found in a specified page of a lecture by Cyril of Jerusalem, *De Uno Deo*. Our excuse for taking this seemingly useless trouble is simply this: Clement's *Ep.* 1 and *Peregrinus* are linked with Cyril in the use of the word προστάτης; this word is used in *Peregrin.* 11,

a section shown to be in close connection with our excerpts in the use of that very word among others; the jesting character of *Peregrinus* has been fully established, and we think we detect a joke in Helladius' use of the word.

In *Cat.* vi. 15, p. 96, is the passage containing the word *προστάτης*, which has been already quoted on pp. 23, 49. A little below Cyril says: καὶ ὁ λέγων Πάλιν ἄλλον τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦ κόσμου, ἐναντιοῦται τῷ Υἱῷ λέγοντι. Comp. with Helladius' excerpt, given in full on p. 53.

This is not sufficient in itself to show a connection. Almost immediately, however, after the use of the word *προστάτης*, Cyril says: οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν. This is found in Excerpt 5. It is an exceedingly common expression, and it will be said that it is "nothing wonderful" that both Cyril and Helladius should use it. On this account, however, the coincidence is a very instructive one, and serves to show that even a coincidence in the use of a very common expression ought not hastily to be dismissed as accidental. The author of *Peregrinus* in § 11 (see p. 47) writes, perhaps sarcastically: τὴν θαυμαστὴν σοφίαν τῶν Χριστιανῶν.

Cyril says: οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, καίπερ ὃν θαυμαστόν Πέτρος γὰρ ἦν, ὁ τὰς κλεῖς τῶν οὐρανῶν περιφέρει. καὶ οὐ θαύματος ἄξιον. Παῦλος γὰρ ἦν, "who was caught up into the third heaven and to paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." We have pointed out that the last part of these words seems to be used in *Peregrin.* 11.

Excerpt 5 runs thus: ὅτι ἱππεῖς μὲν καὶ νομεῖς δεῖ γράφειν καὶ λέγειν τὴν εὐθεῖαν τῶν πληθυντικῶν, οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ τὰς αἰτιατικὰς, ἀλλ' ἱππέας καὶ νομέας· εἰ δὲ καὶ Ξενοφῶν εἶρηκε τοὺς νομεῖς, οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, ἀνὴρ ἐν στρατείαις σχολάζων καὶ ξένων συνουσίαις εἰ τινα παρακόπτει τῆς πατρίου φωνῆς· διὰ νομοθέτην αὐτὸν οὐκ ἂν τις Ἀττικισμοῦ παραλάβοι. Observe the τὰς κλεῖς of Cyril. Suidas writes: Κλεῖς, κλειδός. καὶ ἡ αἰτιατική τῶν πληθυντικῶν, τὰς κλεῖς. Compare Cyril and Suidas with the ἱππεῖς and νομεῖς of Helladius, which, he says, it is unlawful either to write or to utter as accusatives.

It is impossible to contend that this double set of coincidences is a mere accidental circumstance. We have described exactly the way in which they were actually found. It is clear that the excerpts in question have no right to the name of

Helladius. We shall hardly think that Photius manufactured them. We must regard them as interpolations of Photius' *Bibliotheca*.

Two points then, we conceive, are now plainly established.

1. Photius' *Bibliotheca* has been interpolated.

2. *De Morte Peregrini* was not written by Lucian, but was written by the interpolator of the *Bibliotheca*, or by some one intimately acquainted with his secrets. We may, of course, reverse this last position, and suppose that the interpolator became by some means acquainted with the secret history of *De Morte Peregrini*.

These two conclusions will be amply supported as we proceed.

(ε) We have, however, not yet finished with the curious connection between Cyril and Helladius which has been pointed out.

Clement of Rome has a section in which "the keys" play a very singular part. Remember Cyril's *τὰς κλεῖς*, and Helladius' parody of the passage containing them.

In *Ep.* i. 43, Clement gives the familiar narrative of "Aaron's rod that budded." He does not tell the story, however, exactly as it is told in Num. xvii. He draws considerably upon his imagination. So in § 12, where he gives the story of Rahab and the spies, he departs from the scriptural narrative, and by so doing brings himself into that curious connection with the *Evang. Thom.* which has been pointed out on p. 23, and which will be referred to again presently.

In § 43, Clement says that Moses took the rods which had been brought to him and bound them, and sealed them with the rings of the heads of the tribes, and placed them within the tabernacle on the table of God, adding: *καὶ κλείσας τὴν σκηνὴν ἐσφράγισεν τὰς κλεῖδας ὡσαύτως καὶ τὰς ῥάβδους*. When the morning came, Moses showed the seals, opened the doors, and brought out the rods. The second sealing of the rods after the door of the tabernacle had been shut creates a difficulty. The Syriac version steps in to the rescue, for the scribe would appear to have had *θύρας* in his copy of Clement (Light. p. 434) or in his mind.

No part of this sealing, it must be observed, has any warrant in the sacred narrative. Do not the arrangements appear to be a little too elaborately detailed for serious writing? The

simple mention of sealing the door might pass without much remark, although even that would be an embellishment of the scriptural account. Moses, Clement says, sealed the rods; he sealed the keys *ᾠσαύτως καὶ τὰς ῥάβδους*. The last was too much for the gravity of the Syriac scribe, and he suggests *θύρας*. Both the Greek MSS., however, give *ῥάβδους*, and all three MSS. are supposed to spring from one archetype (Light. p. 247). But even with *θύρας*, does not the account read like mere jest? It has a strong family likeness to a story told in the *Evang. Nicodem.* A, p. 237 (*Evang. Apocr.*, Tisch.). The writer, desiring to ridicule the sealing of our Lord's sepulchre, says that the Jewish authorities laid hold on Joseph (because he had begged the Lord's body) and placed him in a room where there was no window. The door (comp. with the Syriac version of Clement's, § 43) was carefully sealed. The key was not; its safety was otherwise, but sufficiently, provided for. *Caiaphas kept the key*. When the door was opened in the morning, Joseph was, of course, missing. The people, the writer says, were much astonished at this, because the seals were unbroken: *καὶ ὅτι τὴν κλεῖδαν εἶχεν ὁ Καϊάφας*. The writer proceeds: *καὶ οὐκέτι ἐτόλμησαν ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς λαλήσαντας ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πιλάτου ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, and his words sound like a recollection of the story of which Clement gives his own peculiar version.

It is noteworthy that Clement begins his narrative: *καὶ τί θαυμαστὸν εἰ κ.τ.λ.* Common as this word *θαυμαστὸν* is, it may perhaps be no less significant than Helladius' *οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν*, with which we shall now compare it.

Clement says: *καὶ τί θαυμαστὸν εἰ οἱ ἐν Χριστῷ πιστευθέντες παρὰ Θεοῦ ἔργον τοιοῦτο κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους; ὅπου καὶ ὁ μακάριος πιστὸς θεράπων ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκῇ Μωϋσῆς τὰ διατεταγμένα αὐτῷ πάντα ἐσημειώσατο ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις, ᾧ καὶ ἐπηκολούθησαν οἱ λοιποὶ προφῆται συνεπιμαρτυροῦντες τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ νομοθετημένοις*. Comp. Helladius' *εἰ... οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν... νομοθέτης*, remembering that his sentence is founded on Cyril's use of *τὰς κλεῖς*. Somewhat lower down Helladius has *ᾠσαύτως καί*. Comp. Clement's use of the expression.

Νομοθέτης hardly seems the natural word in the connection in which Helladius uses it. We have seen that it forms one point of contact between Helladius and *Peregrin.* 11. In

Peregrinus it appears in near company with *προφήτης* and *βίβλων*, just as *νομοθετεῖν* does in Clement with *προφήται* and *βίβλους*. In *Peregrin.* 13 the word is again used. The writer says: *ἔπειτα δὲ ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ πρῶτος ἔπεισεν αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πάντες εἶεν ἀλλήλων, ἐπειδὴν ἅπαξ παραβάντες, θεοὺς μὲν τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς ἀπαρνήσονται, τὸν δὲ ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκείνον σοφιστὴν αὐτῶν προσκυνῶσι, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐκείνου νόμους βιῶσι. καταφρονοῦσιν οὖν ἀπάντων ἐξίσσης, καὶ κοινὰ ἡγοῦνται ἄνευ τινὸς ἀκριβοῦς πίστεως τὰ τοιαῦτα παραδεξάμενοι.*

Who was this *ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ πρῶτος*? Various answers have been given to this question. Among others the name of Moses has been suggested. The question is not worth debating. As with his *μέγαν* in *Peregrin.* 11 (where *νομοθέτης* is also used), so here with *ὁ νομοθ. ὁ πρῶτ.*, the writer no doubt intended to give opportunity for conjectures.

The word in question is used and applied to Moses in some excerpts professedly from Diodorus Siculus, found in Photius *Bibl.* 244. It is there used (p. 380) in near company with *τοῖς ἱερεῦσι*, as in *Peregrin.* 11, and with *προσκυνεῖν*, as in *Peregrin.* 13. Each of the clauses just given from § 13, except the last, is there illustrated, only that the writer of the excerpt is at pains sometimes to express the exactly opposite idea. Thus *μόνους γὰρ ἀπάντων ἔθνων ἀκοινωνήτους, τὸ μῖσος τὸ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, τὸ μηδεὶ ἀλλῶ ἔθνει τραπέζης κοινωνεῖν μηδ' εὐνοεῖν τὸ παράπαν, τὴν μισανθρωπίαν πάντων*, etc., are said of the Jews.

He says, p. 380: *ἐποίησατο δ' ὁ νομοθέτης τῶν τε πολεμικῶν ἔργων πολλὴν πρόνοιαν*, and after two lines: *ἐποιεῖτο δὲ καὶ στρατείας*. Helladius (see p. 55) refuses to acknowledge Xenophon as *νομοθέτην* of Attic Greek, because his life had been spent *ἐν στρατείαις*.

Some few lines above on the same page the writer says: *καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καὶ ἀγιστείας τοῦ θεοῦ κατέδειξε, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν ἐνομοθέτησέ τε καὶ διέταξε*. Comp. with Clement in § 43, quoted above, p. 57.

Νομοθετεῖν is used also on p. 379 (but not in the same excerpt), and there it is almost directly followed by *τὰς ἱεράς αὐτῶν βίβλους*. Comp. with Clement's *ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις* in § 43, quoted above.

There are, it will be seen, a few words out of the passage just quoted from *Peregrin.* 13, for which there is nothing

in any way parallel to be found in the excerpts from Diodorus.

If we turn again to Cyril, *Cat.* vi. 15, p. 96, we find a *πρῶτος* which may have suggested the *ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ πρῶτος* of *Peregrinus*. Cyril says Simon Magus was the *πρῶτος ὁ τῆς κακίας δράκων*. Marcion followed him, and Cyril writes: ὑπὸ γὰρ τῶν κειμένων ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ μαρτυριῶν ἐλεγχόμενος, πρῶτος ἐτόλμησεν ἐκκόψαι τὰς μαρτυρίας, καὶ ἀμάρτυρον ἀφεῖναι τὸν καταγγελλόμενον λόγον τῆς πίστεως. Comp. with the *ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ πρῶτος . . . ἀνευ τινὸς ἀκριβοῦς πίστεως τὰ τοιαῦτα παραδεξάμενοι*. *Peregrin.* 13.

We expect, of course, that this idea of Cyril's will appear (Proteus-like) elsewhere. Accordingly we find, whether it is an accidental circumstance or not, an answering *συνεπίμαρτυροῦντες κ.τ.λ.* in Clement's words in § 43, given above.

In the same § 43 we find *ζήλου ἐμπεσόντος*, and after some few lines, but still in § 43, *μάλιστα ἤδειν ἄλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἀκαταστασία γένηται ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ*, and after five lines, but in § 44, *διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν*. Now, strangely enough, by again going to a source to which we have shown that *Peregrin.* 13 is seemingly indebted, we shall find Clement's words now given to be illustrated.

Immediately after the passage just quoted out of Cyril, Basilides is spoken of. It will be remembered that in § β, p. 49, we produced out of Epiphanius' remarks on the heresy of Basilides: *τὸν Σίμωνα ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι* (*Hæres.* xxiv. 3, p. 71) in illustration of *Peregrin.* 13. This section of *Peregrinus* we have shown to be connected with Clement's § 43. Is it not remarkable that only seven lines below *ἀνασκολοπ.* Epiphanius should write: *δι' ἣν εἶδεν ὁ πατὴρ ἀκαταστασίαν ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις*, followed after a few lines in the same page by: *διὰ ταύτην γὰρ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἡδυπαθείας πολλοὶ εἰς τὴν αἵρεσιν ἐμπίπτουσιν*? Comp. with Clement's words just given. These coincidences are made still more remarkable by observing that above *ἀνασκολοπ.* Epiphanius writes: *διὰ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀγγέλων παραζήλωσιν*, and after two lines: *τούτου ἕνεκα πόλεμοι πάντοτε καὶ ἀκαταστασίαι κατ' αὐτῶν ἐπανέστησαν*. Comp. *ἐκ τούτου ζήλος . . . καὶ ἀκαταστασία, πόλεμος*, Clem. i. 3. *Ζήλος* is the burden of the following sections, and *διὰ ζήλος* or *ζήλον* occurs many

times. Of course here, as so often, the noticeable circumstance is the way in which these coincidences are found.

We make no remark here upon the bearing of all these various circumstances connected with Clement's § 43, which have been pointed out upon the question of the genuineness of Clement's *Ep.* 1. We only say, that if any person is disposed to look upon § 43 as nothing but elaborate jest and parody, he will certainly have some justification for his opinion.

§ 3. It will be necessary now to return to the *Evang. Thom.*

Our first introduction to this apocryphal gospel was through a page of Philo, which supplied a parallel both for the gospel and for *Peregrinus*. On examination of the gospel it appeared that the writer had parodied a verse of the book of Proverbs, and that in working out his parody he had used the language of Eccles. xii. This was a hint to examine the chapters of Ecclesiastes immediately preceding. On doing this it was found that suggestions for some of the sections of the gospel had, to all appearance, been received from these chapters, and notably that the *σχίζων ξύλα* of Eccles. x. 9 had been taken up in *Evang. Thom.* A 10 (B 9). It was then shown that the *Evang. Thom.* A 9 (B 8) was somewhat closely connected with *Peregrin.* 9.

This *Peregrin.* 9 is, however, as we have seen, indebted to Aristophanes. We have now, therefore, to retrace our steps to discover whether the *Evang. Thom.* and *Peregrinus* meet in Aristophanes as they before met in Philo. We turn, it must be observed, to certain passages definitely marked out for us by their seeming use in *Peregrinus*. If we expect to find coincidences for the gospel in Aristophanes at all, this must be because we believe the writer of the gospel to have been just as fond of parody and jest as Aristophanes. But if we expect to find them in certain specified places, this can only be because of the connection between the gospel and *Peregrinus* which has been pointed out.

1. For convenience' sake we shall begin with *Plut.* 544.

We did not find much here for *Peregrinus*, nor do we now for the *Evang. Thom.* This neighbourhood was taken more notice of in other quarters. In 515, Aristophanes has *γῆς ἀρότροις ῥήξας*. On these words the scholiast says: *δι' ἀρότρου*

σχίσας, τέμων τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν. We shall hereafter find that these words are made use of in an excerpt professedly from Diodorus Siculus (Phot. *Bibl.* 244), which gives an account of the hermaphrodite. In the *Evang. Thom.* A 13, p. 144, however, it is said that Joseph τέκτων ἦν καὶ ἐποίει ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἄροτρα.

2. *Plut.* 168, *vid. sup.* p. 47.

In 163 is τεκταίνεται. The scholiast says: τέκτων ἐστί. Comp. τέκτων ἦν just given.

In 169 we find οἱμοι τάλας. Comp. οἱμοι, ἡπορήθην ὁ τάλας ἐγώ, *Evang. Thom.* A 7, p. 140. In the same § 7, p. 141, the writer says: ἐνθυμοῦμαι, φίλοι, τὴν αἰσχύνην, ὅτι γέρων ὑπάρχων ὑπὸ παιδίου ἐνίκηθην· καὶ ἔχω ἐκκακῆσαι καὶ ἀποθανεῖν διὰ τούτου τοῦ παιδός· οὐ δύναμαι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἡρᾷ ταύτῃ ἐμβλέψαι εἰς τὴν ὄψιν αὐτοῦ. καὶ πάντων εἰπόντων ὅτι ἐνίκηθην ὑπὸ παιδίου μικροῦ, τί ἔχω εἰπεῖν; and directly: οὗτος τί ποτε μέγα ἐστίν, ἢ θεὸς ἢ ἄγγελος, ἢ τί εἶπω οὐκ οἶδα; and after one line: τὸ παιδίον μέγα. We observe here that the μέγας βασιλεὺς of *Plut.* 170, which we have shown to be taken up by τὸν μέγαν in *Peregrin.* 11, is here represented by μέγα and τὸ παιδίον μέγα. Notice μικρόν with the diminutive; the following μέγα points out the joke. Comp. further, 147, where Aristophanes writes: ἐγωγέ τοι διὰ μικρὸν ἀργυρίδιον δοῦλος γεγένημαι. Notice here also μικρόν with a diminutive. The writer of the *Evang. Thom.* has just said: ἡγωνίζομην ἔχειν μαθητὴν, καὶ εὗρέθην ἔχειν διδάσκαλον. The point of the jest lies in the fact that Plutus is here in disguise: ἐν σχήματι ἀνδρός, as the scholiast says. Διὰ τοῦτον is used here five times. We shall show in the next chapter that there is in Clement's *Ep.* i. 36 an answering διὰ τούτου (comp. here) five times repeated, and the connection will then be pointed out between Clement and the gospel, and between both and Aristophanes.

3. *Nub.* 967–1066, *vid. sup.* p. 46; *infr.* p. 64.

In 1070, comp. τί δῆτ' ἐρεῖς, ἣν τοῦτο νικηθῆς ἐμοῦ with the words from the *Evang. Thom.* A 7, just given.

In 992 are found: ὑπὸ ταῖς μορίαις. In explanation of the word as applied to the sacred olive trees in the Acropolis of Athens, the scholiast tells the story of the sad fate (μόρου) of the son of Poseidon, who was sent to cut down one of these trees: ὁ δὲ ἀνατείνας τὸν πέλεκυν καὶ ταύτης ἀποτυχῶν

ἔπληξεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπέθανε. Another version has: ταύτης μὲν ἡστούχησε, τὸν δὲ πόδα αὐτοῦ πλήξας ἐτελεύτησε κ.τ.λ.

In *Evang. Thom.* A 10 (B 9), the σχίζων ξύλα of Eccles. x. 9 is taken up: καὶ μετ' ὀλίγας ἡμέρας σχίζων τις τῶν γειτόνων ξύλον ἀπέτεμε τὴν βάσιν τοῦ ποδὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ πελίκυος, καὶ ἔξαιμος γεγονῶς ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν. B. καὶ ἐκράτησεν τοῦ νεανίσκου τὸν πεπληγότα πόδαν, καὶ εὐθέως ἰάθη. εἶπε δὲ τῷ νεανίσκῳ Ἀνάστα νῦν, σχίζε τὰ ξύλα καὶ μνημόνευέ μοι. A. The thing, of course, here to be noticed is the singular way in which we have come upon the scholiast's most appropriate story.

When dealing with *Peregrin.* 11, we had occasion to refer to Arist. *Pac.* 667, and also to *Vesp.* 876. In *Pac.* 702 it is said: "And thou, O mortal, go on thy way rejoicing, and remember me." In *Vesp.* 875 is γαῖτον, and a little below: οὐδεὶς ἀνὴρ τῶν νεωτέρων. Compare all with the words of *Evang. Thom.* just given.

Stephens has shown us (*vid. supr.* p. 16) that he was in the habit in his parodies, by the introduction of a word or two, to "look at" some remarkable story or other. We seem to have here, in the *Evang. Thom.*, more examples than one of the same kind of thing.

In an excerpt professedly from Agatharchides (*Phot. Bibl.* 250), the elephant hunters and their modes of capturing the elephant are described. Three methods are mentioned. In the first and third the "axe" plays a conspicuous part. In the first and third also, the death of the victim was of the same lingering kind. The hunters, we are informed, were wont to cut the flesh from the hinderparts of the elephant while it was still alive: καὶ ποιήσαντες ἔξαιμον τὸ ζῶον, εἶτα νεκρὸν κ.τ.λ., p. 453. Compare with *Evang. Thom.*

The scholiast's story, again, might seem to have reminded our writer of Herodotus' account of the brave deed of Hegesistratus. This man's feet, or rather foot, had been put into the stocks, and his death was intended. He, however, obtained possession (ἐκράτησε) of a knife, and (after one line) Herodotus says: σταθμησάμενος γὰρ ὅπως ἐξελεύσεται οἱ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ ποδός, ἀπέτεμε τὸν ταρσὸν ἑωυτοῦ, ix. 37. Compare with the *Evang. Thom.* The natural consequence of this surgical operation was that one leg became shorter than the other. It

was necessary, therefore, as Herodotus says, to supply a *ξύλινον πόδα*. In the so-called excerpts from Helladius, there is a witticism upon the same subject: *ὅτι, φησί, τοῦ βασιλέως Κορίνθου ἡ μήτηρ, γυνὴ δὲ Ἀμφίωνος, κολοβωτέρῳ σκάζουσα τῷ ἐτέρῳ ποδί, Λάβδα ἐκαλεῖτο*.

We venture to think that the writer of the *Evāng. Thom.* makes himself merry with these things in § 13 A (11 B). We will place the two versions side by side.

A 13.

Ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ τέκτων ἦν, καὶ ἐποίει ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγοὺς. ἐπετάγη αὐτῷ κράββατος παρὰ τινος πλουσίου ὅπως ποιήσει αὐτῷ. τοῦ δὲ ἐνὸς κανόνος τοῦ καλουμένου ἐναλλάκτου μὴ ἔχοντες τί ποιῆσαι, εἶπεν τὸ παιδίον ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὅτις κάτω τὰ δύο ξύλα, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ μέσου μέρος ἰσοποίησον αὐτά. καὶ ἐποίησεν Ἰωσήφ καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ παιδίον. ἔστη δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκ τοῦ ἐτέρου μέρος καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὸ κολοβώτερον ξύλον, καὶ ἐκτείνας αὐτὸ ἵσον ἐποίησεν τοῦ ἄλλου. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἐθαύμασε, καὶ περιλαβὼν τὸ παιδίον κατεφίλει λέγων Μακάριός εἰμι, ὅτι τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο δέδωκέ μοι ὁ θεός.

B 11.

Φθάσας δὲ τὸ ὀγδόον τῆς ἡλικίας ἔτος, προετάγη ὁ Ἰωσήφ ὑπὸ τινος πλουσίου κράββατον οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτῷ τέκτων γὰρ ἦν. καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ πρὸς συλλογὴν ξύλων, συνῆλθεν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. καὶ κόψας δύο ξύλα καὶ πελεκίσας τὸ ἐν ἔθηκεν πλησίον τοῦ ἄλλου, καὶ μετρήσας εὔρεν αὐτὸ κολοβώτερον, καὶ ἰδὼν ἐλυπήθη, καὶ ἐζήτηε εὔρεϊν ἕτερον. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτῷ ὅτις τὰ δύο ταῦτα ὁμοῦ πρὸς ἰσότητα ἀμφοτέρων προτομῶν. καὶ διαπορούμενος ὁ Ἰωσήφ περὶ τούτου, τί βούληται τὸ παιδίον, ἐποίησεν τὸ προσταχθέν. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ πάλιν Κράτησον ἰσχυρῶς τὸ κολοβὸν ξύλον. καὶ θαυμάζων ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἐκράτησεν αὐτό. τότε κρατήσας καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸ ἕτερον ἄκρον εἵλκυσε αὐτοῦ τὴν ἄλλην προτομήν· ἐποίησεν καὶ κεῖνο ἵσον τοῦ ἄλλου ξύλου, καὶ φησι πρὸς τὸν Ἰωσήφ Μηκέτι λυποῦ, ἀλλὰ ποίει ἀκωλύτως τὸ ἔργον σου.

This narrative appears to be, as already stated on p. 42, a parody of Prov. xxx. 4: *τίς ἐκράτησε πάντων τῶν ἄκρων τῆς γῆς*; We have now to trace out the particular form which the parody assumes.

Τέκτων ἦν and *ἄροτρα* we have lately found.

(1.) We shall examine first of all some scriptural sources to which the narrative seems indebted.

Κράββατος is used in both versions. S. John uses this word

in chap. v., which gives an account of the healing of the impotent man on the Sabbath day. This miracle excited the anger of the Jews. In ver. 18 are the words: ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ Θεῷ. Comp. with *Evang. Thom. A.* This version takes up the breaking of the Sabbath by miraculous acts in § 2. The writer says: ἰδὼν δὲ τις Ἰουδαῖος ἃ ἐποίει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν σαββάτῳ παίζων, ἀπῆλθε παρακρῆμα καὶ ἀνήγγειλε κ.τ.λ. In S. John, ver. 15, it is said: ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἀνήγγειλε κ.τ.λ., and in ver. 16: ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ. Compare. Observe also the opening words of A 13 above, with which also compare: ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σάββασι κ.τ.λ. S. Matt. xii. 1. In ver. 2 it is said: ἴδου οἱ μαθηταί σου ποιοῦσιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ, and in *Evang. Thom. A 2*: διὰ τί ταῦτα ποιεῖς ἐν σαββάτῳ ἃ οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν, adopting the form of S. Luke vi. 2. In Num. xv. 32 we are told that a man was found συλλέγοντα ξύλα on the Sabbath day. Compare with the πρὸς συλλογὴν ξύλων of the *Evang. Thom. B 11* (given above), certainly an unnatural expression for the procuring of timber for the purposes of carpentry.

The interweaving of these various narratives into the pages of the gospel is very obvious and very instructive. Why may we not believe Aristophanes and other authors to be used in the same fashion? And why may there not be other literary mosaics besides this apocryphal gospel?

(2.) The passage of Aristophanes which is still before us is *Nub.* 967–1066, *vid. supr.* pp. 46, 61.

In 970 are the words: οὐδ' ἴσχειν τὸ πῶδ' ἐναλλάξ. (Comp. the ἐναλλάκτον μὴ ἔχοντες of the gospel.) Here, then, again we have “two feet,” and in company with them the word ἐναλλάξ. We have (*vid. supr.* p. 62) discussed the story of the injured foot, and found in Herodotus another story, to which the writer of the *Evang. Thom.* seems to refer, in which mention is made of “a wooden foot” to supply the loss occasioned by Hegesistratus’ too free use of the knife. From the pseudo-Helladian excerpts we learn that *κολοβάτερος* is the proper word to use under such circumstances. Here in the *Evang. Thom.* we find two pieces of wood intended for two parts of a bedstead. The novel word *ἐναλλάκτης* is used to describe these. One of these pieces is too short, and, since it was expressly cut for the purpose, too short from the too free use

of the knife or axe. This defective piece is said to be *κολοβάτερος*. We would suggest that the bedstead is intended to be of the "stretcher" form. The *ἐναλλάκτης* will then be the "crosspiece fitting into another crosspiece," and at the same time the "leg." The writer of the gospel deserves some credit for being the first to make this novel but apt use of the word. It would be perhaps imputing too much to his ingenious mind to suggest that he had an eye also to the commoner meaning of *ἐναλλάξ* ("interchangeably"), and to the swaying to and fro, first this way and then that, to which the bedstead would have been subject if the defect had not been remedied. Anyway, the story here before us in the *Evang. Thom.* seems to spring naturally from what has just preceded, coupled with the words of Aristophanes.

Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* gives "crosswise" as the meaning of *ἐναλλάξ* here in Aristophanes ("crosslegged," as we should say). We may illustrate this meaning by Gen. xlviii. 14: *ἐκτείνας δὲ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν χεῖρα τὴν δεξιὰν ἐπέβαλεν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἐφραΐμ, οὗτος δὲ ἦν ὁ νεώτερος, καὶ τὴν ἀριστερὰν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Μανασσῆ, ἐναλλάξ τὰς χεῖρας*. It is evident that the writer of *Evang. Thom.* consulted this passage. Observe the *ἐκτείνας* exactly in A; and comp. *εἶπε δὲ Ἰωσήφ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. υἱοί μου εἰσὶν οὗς ἔδωκέ μοι ὁ θεὸς ἐνταῦθα*, ver. 9, and *καὶ ἐφίλησεν αὐτούς, καὶ περιέλαβεν αὐτούς*, ver. 10, with the close of A. Under the circumstances in which they are found, these coincidences cannot be regarded as accidental, and they tell their own tale. An interest evidently was felt in the word *ἐναλλάξ*. Aristotle uses *ἐναλλάξ ἐμπίπτειν* (Lid. and Scott's *Lex.*), "of two things which fit into one another." *Part. An.* iii. 1. 5. Only a few lines below we read *τοῦ ἐνὸς καλουμένου σκάρου*; we shall therefore probably conclude that our writer consulted or called to mind Aristotle as well as the book of Genesis.

(3.) The writer of the *Evang. Thom.*, however, does not use *ἐναλλάξ*, but *ἐναλλάκτης*. Aquila uses the word in Isa. iii. 4, *καὶ ἐναλλάτται κυριεύσουσιν αὐτῶν*. It is here apparently in the sense of "exchangers." This does not help us at all as to the meaning of the word as applied to a bedstead. Aquila's use of the word is nevertheless of great interest. The closing

¹ The use of Isa. iii. is confirmed by the Latin version of the *Evang. Thom.*, which has, "Erat architector Ioseph." Tisch. p. 166.

words of the preceding verse are, καὶ σοφὸν¹ ἀρχιτέκτονα καὶ συνετὸν ἀκροατὴν. They could not fail to recall to the minds of such students of Aristophanes as our writers have shown themselves to be, *Av.* 1154 sq.: ὄρνιθες ἦσαν τέκτονες σοφώτατοι πελεκῶντες, οἳ τοῖς ῥύγχεσιν ἀπεπελέκησαν τὰς πύλας· ἦν δ' ὁ κτύπος αὐτῶν πελεκῶντων ὥσπερ ἐν ναυπηγίᾳ. The scholiast on *πελεκ.* says, παρὰ τὸ πελεκῶν τὰ ξύλα; and on ἀπεπελ. he writes: πελεκῶ, πελεκήσω, ξύλα, πελεκίζω τὸ μετὰ τῆς σπάθης κόπτω. Comp. with the *Evang. Thom.* B.

In *Av.* 1132 we find ἀκοδόμησαν αὐτό (cf. the οἰκοδ. αὐτῷ above), and in 1130, ἐμέτρησ' αὐτ' ἐγώ; in 1104, ὀρθῶ μετρήσω κανόνι προστιθείς, and 1006, ὁδοὶ ὀρθαὶ πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ μέσον. Comp. with *Evang. Thom.*

This passage of Aristophanes is not one which has been before consulted, and we therefore naturally consider whether there are any indications of its use in *Peregrinus*.

In *Av.* 1125 we observe κάλλιστον ἔργον, and after one line καὶ Θεαγένης. Comp. καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ σελήνη ἀνέτειλεν (ἔδει γὰρ κἀκείνην θεάσασθαι τὸ κάλλιστον τοῦτο ἔργον), and after one line καὶ μάλιστα ὁ γεννάδας ὁ ἐκ Πατρῶν (Theagenes). *Peregrin.*¹ 36.

In *Av.* 1058 there is an interesting parallel for Clement's *Ep.* i. Aristophanes writes: ἤδη μοι τῷ πανόπτα καὶ παντάρχα θνητοὶ πάντες θύσουσ' εὐκταίαις εὐχαῖς. Comp. λοιπὸν ὁ παντεπόπτης θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ κύριος πάσης σαρκός, i. 64, with εὐκταίαν a few lines below.

We shall have occasion to return to Aristophanes in the next chapter, and it will then be seen that Clement's § 64 is

¹ With these words further comp. πῶς, τὸδ' εἰ καλὸν τοῦργον, σκότου δέϊ, καὶ πρήχειρος εἴ κ' ἀπαυῖν; *Soph. El.* 1493. If the writer looked, as we ourselves did, at the beginning of the play, he would find in line 67: ἀλλ', ὦ πατὴρ γῆς καὶ τ' ἐγχώριοι, δίζασθέ μ' εὐτυχῶντα ταῖςδε ταῖς ὁδοῖς, σύ τ', ὦ πατὴρ δῶμα. In *Peregrin.* 36, after 8 lines, we read: Δαίμονες μητρῶοι καὶ πατρῶοι, δίζασθέ με εὐμενεῖς. *Vid. sup.* p. 46 for the suggestion.

It is worth while to notice the way in which the first passage from Sophocles was found. On p. 48 attention is directed to τὸν μέγαν γοῦν in *Peregrin.* 11, and to the difficulty which has been felt both with μέγαν and γοῦν. It was suggested that μέγαν was written, but that μάγον was in the writer's mind. A γοῦν was shown in *Plut.* 184. If we consult Thomas Magister on γοῦν, we find *Plut.* 184 quoted; also *Plut.* 147, shown on p. 61, to be used in the *Evang. Thom.*; also as from *Soph. El.* τὰ γοῦν σά. These words are in line 1499, while the passage above quoted is from 1493. The line runs: τὰ γοῦν σ'· ἐγὼ σοι μάντις εἰμὶ τῶνδ' ἄκρος. This might easily have suggested μάγος. We shall see presently that μάντις is apparently taken up by another writer.

closely connected with *Plut.* 168 sq., used, as we have seen, in *Peregrinus* and the *Evang. Thom.*

(4.) In *Av.* 1159 (we began with 1154) Aristophanes has *βεβαλάνωται*. The scholiast writes: *ὅτι βάλανοι λέγονται κ.τ.λ.* *Κολοβοὶ τὰς βαλάνους* is an expression found in Strabo xvi. p. 771. Directly afterwards, speaking of the elephant-hunters and their three methods of securing their prey, he has *ἐκ θατέρου μέρους*. Comp. our writers *ἐκ τοῦ ἐτέρου μέρους* in A 13 above. This is followed in Strabo, after two lines, by *καταπηδήσαντες ἀπό*. Comp. *κατεπήδησεν ἀπὸ τοῦ στέγου καὶ ἔστη παρὰ τὸ πτώμα τοῦ παιδίου*. *Evang. Thom.* A 9.

We referred on p. 62 to certain excerpts from Agatharchides, found in Phot. *Bibl.* 250, and to the account of the elephant-hunters therein contained. The writings of Agatharchides were known to Strabo, and if these excerpts are what they profess to be, he made far greater use of those writings than he cared to acknowledge.

If we turn again to Agatharchides' account of the elephant-hunters, the eye falls at once upon *ἐπὰν δὲ τὸ ζῶον . . . πίση, οἱ συνθραταὶ παραγίνονται ἐπὶ τὸ πτώμα*, p. 452. Comp. with A 9 just quoted. *Πτώμα* is not used by Strabo nor by Diodorus, who has an account of the elephant-hunters, which is supposed to be taken mainly from Agatharchides. Agatharchides here describes the first method of taking the elephant. From the third we gave on p. 62 a coincidence with *Evang. Thom.* B 9. The second method, as described by Agatharchides, differs somewhat from Strabo's. Both agree in saying that a bow was used, and that three men were engaged in the operation. Strabo says that two men held the bow while the other pulled the string. Agatharchides, however, writes: *ὁ μὲν εἰς κατέχει τὸ τόξον τῷ ποδὶ προσβεβηκώς, οἱ δὲ δύο τὴν νευρὰν ἐλκύσαντες ἐκ τῆς ἀπάσης βίας ἀφῆκαν τὸ βέλος*. Nine lines below, in the description of the third method, we find: *ὥστε τοὺς μὲν δύο πῶδας τοὺς πλησίον τοῦ στελέχους*, with *τοῦ ξύλου* after one line. Comp. all with *Evang. Thom.* quoted p. 63.

The *κολοβοὶ τὰς βαλάνους* of Strabo appear in the excerpts, cap. xxx. p. 453. Half a dozen lines above we observe *ἀπό τινος*, with *παραπλησίον* in the next line. Comp. the *παρά τινος πλουσίον* of A 13. Nor is this so wild a conjecture as it would at first sight appear to be.

Immediately after the sentence describing the *κολοβούς*, Photius breaks the thread of his account of the Troglodytes by saying: *ὅτι κέχρηται ὁ συγγραφεύς, ἀπτιζιστῆς καίτοι ὦν, τῇ τῆς καμάρας λέξει*. He then resumes his narrative. What is the meaning of this remark so strangely introduced? The translator of the excerpts writes: "Hinc digressionem facta auctor monet se, quamvis Attice loquatur, Camerae (urbis in Creta) tamen dialecto familiariter uti;" which is a good deal more than a translation of the Greek. The digression, moreover, appears to belong to Photius rather than to Agatharchides. We may compare a somewhat parallel remark in the Helladian Excerpts, p. 535: *ὅτι οὗτος ὁ συγγραφεύς, ὁ ταῦτα συνταξάμενος, γένος μὲν Αἰγύπτιος ἦν, πόλεως δὲ τῆς Ἀντινόου ἢ, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπιγράφει, Βησαντινίου, ἱαμβικῶ δὲ μέτρῳ διεξῆλθε τὰ προκειμένα*. This would lead us to suppose Photius to be responsible for the interruption. Photius, again, often uses *λέξις*, but certainly usually in the sense of "word." So in *Bibl.* 213, where he describes in glowing colours the writings of Agatharchides, he uses *λέξις* several times over, e.g. *μὴ καιναῖς κεχρημένος λέξεσι*. That *λέξις* should be so rendered here receives some little confirmation from the circumstance that whereas the narrative goes on to speak of the strange funeral rites of the Troglodytes, and the words *οὕτω ταῖς κηδείαις καταχρῶνται*¹ *νοννεχῶς* occur, in *Bibl.* 213 Photius goes on to write *κέχρηται δὲ καὶ γνῶμαις τὸ νοννεχῆς . . . ἐπιδηλούσαις*. He is saying that Agatharchides dressed out old words with new meanings. Nowhere else in the excerpts, however, does *καμάρα* appear. We shall show where it does come from presently, meanwhile we merely call attention to the strange way in which Photius introduces his remark.

This word *καμάρα*, which may be a town in Crete, may also mean a bed or couch. So Arrian (vii. 25) uses it for the bed on which Alexander was carried. It happens that Diodorus gives a very particular description in lib. xviii. 26 sq. of the gorgeous chariot on which the body of Alexander was

¹ The excerpt proceeds: *εἴπερ μὴ λυπεῖν ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλυπήτοις συνέσειας σημείον*. Comp. *μὴ οὖν λυπεῖσθω ὁ εὐσεβής, ἔαν ἐπὶ τοῖς νῦν χρόνοις ταλαιπωρῇ· μακάριος αὐτὸν ἀναμίνει χρόνος· ἐκεῖνος ἄνω μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναβιώσας εὐφρανθήσεται εἰς τὸν ἀλύπτητον αἰῶνα*. Clem. ii. 19. There is a certain connection in thought besides the mere verbal coincidence. Comp. further the *μηκέτι λυποῦ* of the *Evang. Thom.* in the section now in hand, quoted p. 63.

carried. In this description, the word *καμάρα* constantly appears, e.g., *τὰς τῆς καμάρας γωνίας*. In *Evang. Thom.* A 10 we are told that the young man was cutting wood: *ἐν τῇ γωνίᾳ*. The selection of a "corner" seems peculiar; it would, however, no doubt explain the accident. In A the tool used is called *ἄξινη*, which might well have been suggested by Diodorus' *σιδηροῦν*. *τῶν δ' ἄξόνων τὰ προέχοντα χρυσᾷ κατεσκευάστο προτομάς ἔχοντα λεόντων σιβήνην ὁδὰξ κατεχούσας*. *κατὰ δὲ μέσον τὸ μῆκος εἶχον πόλον ἐνηρμοσμένον μηχανικῶς ἐν μέσῃ τῇ καμάρᾳ*, κ.τ.λ., with *ζευγῶν* after two lines. Comp. with A 13, B 11, quoted p. 63. We shall find ourselves brought to the same pages of Diodorus presently by another road.

(5.) The word *καμάρα* is used once in the Sacred Scriptures: *ὁ στήσας ὡς καμάραν τὸν οὐρανόν*, Isa. xl. 22. Ver. 20 runs, *ξύλον γὰρ ἄσηπτον ἐκλέγεται τέκτων, καὶ σοφῶς ζητήσῃ πῶς στήσῃ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ*. In verse 25 the LXX. has *νῦν οὖν τίμι με ὁμοιάσατε*, but Symmachus and Theodotion *καὶ ἰσωθήσομαι*. Comp. with A 13, B 11, quoted p. 63.

There is a certain special interest belonging to these last coincidences. We have pointed out on p. 42, that the miraculous story of the bedstead which we are now discussing, and the miraculous carrying of water in the Lord's garment, seem to be parodies of Prov. xxx. 4. We have also said that Lightfoot quotes this verse of the Proverbs, in illustration of an apocryphal quotation found in Clement's *Ep.* ii. 4: *ἐὰν ᾗτε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου*, κ.τ.λ. "The image and expressions are derived," Lightfoot remarks, "from Isa. xl. 11: *τῷ βραχίονι αὐτοῦ συνάξει ἄρνας καὶ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ βαστάσει*." The last clause is only found in some few mss. It is, however, the reading of Aquila and Symmachus. It must be observed that there is a good deal in Isa. xl. to suggest the verse in the Proverbs. Ver. 12 runs: *τίς ἐμέτρησε τῇ χειρὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν δρακί;* and ver. 28: *ὁ θεὸς ὁ κατασκευάσας τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς*. Prov. xxx. 4 might thus easily have been suggested.

We have just quoted vv. 11, 12. The preceding words from the close of ver. 10 are quoted by Clement, in *Ep.* i. 34, in his own peculiar fashion. In the LXX. they are: *ἰδοὺ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ*; but in

Clement: ἰδοὺ ὁ Κύριος, καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστω κατὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ. This is thought to be “a confusion of Isa. xl. 10 and Isa. xlii. 11,” with “an ending either from Prov. xxiv. 12 or (more probably) Rev. xxii. 12” (Light.). Eusebius, however, in his *Comment. in Isa.* xl. 10, quotes the verse and adds: ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς δευτέρας τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας, καθ’ ἣν ἥξει ἐν δόξῃ ἀποδώσων ἐκάστω κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. A few lines above, Eusebius has ταῦτα τῇ τῶν προλεχθέντων ἔπεται διανοία. Comp. οὐ παρακολουθήσω τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτοῦ, *Evang. Thom.* A 7, p. 140. The gospel proceeds: “I deceived myself, thrice-wretched man that I am: ἡγωνιζόμεν ἔχειν μαθητὴν, καὶ εὐρέθην ἔχειν διδάσκαλον.” Soon after the passage just given from § 34, Clement writes in § 35: καὶ ταῦτα ὑπέπιπτεν πάντα ὑπὸ τὴν διάνοιαν ἡμῶν, and in the next line: ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῶν αἰώνων ὁ πανάγιος αὐτὸς γινώσκει τὴν ποσότητα καὶ τὴν καλλονὴν αὐτῶν. ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀγωνισώμεθα εὐρεθῆναι κ.τ.λ. Compare. Turning again to Eusebius, we find εἴτ’ ἐπειδήπερ ἐκ μεγέθους καὶ καλλονῆς κτισμάτων ἀναλόγως ὁ γενεσιουργὸς θεωρεῖται κ.τ.λ.

In § 34, Clement proceeds to quote Dan. vii. 10 (but inverting the clauses): μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστῆκεισαν αὐτῷ, καὶ χίλιαι χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐκέκραγον· ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος σαβαώθ, πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. The latter part is “a loose quotation” from LXX. Isa. vi. 3. If we turn to Jerome’s *Comment. in Isa.* xl., we find, p. 492, that Dan. vii. 10 is there quoted (but without inversion of the clauses), and that his very next words are, “unde et Dominus Sabaoth appellatur,” etc.

We turn now to Eusebius on Isa. vi. 3. He reads with Clement ἐκέκραγον. The LXX. has καὶ ἐκέκραγεν ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον κ.τ.λ. Dan. vii. 10 is given here also, but not with the clauses transposed. Clement goes on: καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἐν ὁμοιοῖᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες τῇ συνειδήσει, ὥς ἐξ ἐνὸς στόματος βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκτενῶς εἰς τὸ μετόχους κ.τ.λ. Observe the stress laid upon unity—one mind, one place, one mouth. Eusebius, on the other hand, goes on: οὐ μίαν γὰρ ἡφίεσαν φωνήν, οὐδὲ ἀθρώως ὁμοῦ πάντα κοινῇ ταύτην ἀνέπεμπον, ἀλλ’ ἕτερον πρὸς τὸ ἕτερον κ.τ.λ.; and presently: οὐκ ἔτι ἐνὸς οἴκου, μυρίων δὲ κ.τ.λ. Turning again to Eusebius on Isa xl., we find, on ver. 5, καὶ οὐδαμῶς Πνεύματος ἁγίου μέτοχοι

πάντες ἄνθρωποι. "Οτι Κύριος ἐλάλησεν. ἀψευδὴς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος. Φωνὴ λέγοντος, Βόησον. Καὶ εἶπα, Τί βοήσω. Comp. with passage just quoted from Clement. The use of these words will be confirmed directly. Eusebius here appears to look at Heb. x. 23: πιστὸς γὰρ ἐπαγγειλάμενος. In ver. 22 we observe ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς; and in ver. 25, μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν. Compare with Clement.

Various verses of Isa. xl., and among them ver. 22, containing καμᾶρα, are quoted by Eusebius in his *Præp. Evang.* vii. 11. Presently, p. 319, he gives a very peculiar version of LXX. Ps. cxxxviii. 8: ἐὰν στρώσω εἰς τὸν ἄδην, πάρει. Clement, in *Ep.* i. 28, has a marvellous version of some verses of this psalm, in which he might be thought to take into his own hands the first clause of Prov. xxx. 4: τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ κατέβη; the rest of the verse being sported with in the 2d *Epistle*, and in the *Evang. Thom.* Clement writes: ἐὰν καταστρώσω εἰς τὰς ἀβύσσους, ἐκεῖ τὸ πνεῦμά σου. The LXX. reads: ἐὰν καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ἄδην, πάρει. Clement has another (out of a great many) peculiarity. He reads: εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς γῆς, instead of εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς θαλάσσης with the LXX. Eusebius, in the context, has, ἐξ ἔσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

In chap. xv. p. 326, Eusebius quotes Dan. vii. 10, with the inverted clauses, as Clement does. Eusebius prefaces the text with διὸ . . . παριστάς τις θεολόγων φησι; Clement with λειπουργοῦσιν παρεστῶτες λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή.

The order in which the coincidences just given follow one another seems to indicate a connection in the process of composition between Clement's i. 28 (containing LXX. Ps. cxxxviii. 7-10) and i. 34 (containing Isa. xl. 10). This conjecture is confirmed by reference to Clem. Alex., *Strom.* iv. 22, p. 625, where the passage from Isaiah immediately follows that from the Psalm. That from Isaiah is in the words of our § 34, and Lightfoot consequently concludes that the Roman Clement is being copied. That from the Psalm so closely resembles the version in our § 34, that here again Lightfoot concludes that Clement of Alexandria "derived it through the medium of the Roman Clement." To the passage from Isaiah, in Clem. Alex., there is tacked on, so as to

form one citation, 1 Cor. ii. 9, in the very words of S. Paul. This verse forms the third and last quotation in our § 34. The words *ὁ Θεός* are, however, omitted; *ἄ* is altered into *ὅσα* (a v.l. in 1 Cor. ii. 9 of nearly, if not quite, equal authority), and *ἀγαπᾶσιν* into the *ὑπομένουσιν* of the LXX. Isa. lxiv. 4. Clement of Alexandria, it must be observed, does not name the Roman Clement, nor does he do so anywhere in the immediate neighbourhood. Beyond question, the natural inference from the foregoing is that the epistle of Clement (so called) borrowed from Clem. Alex. The other coincidences just pointed out look in the same direction, and, indeed, cannot be satisfactorily explained on any other theory.

This idea is confirmed by reference to Clement's ii. 11. He writes:—

πιστὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος τὰς ἀντιμισθίας ἀποδιδόναι ἑκάστῳ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ· ἐὰν οὖν ποιήσωμεν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰσέξομεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ληψόμεθα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, αἷς οὗς οὐκ ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶδεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. ἐκδεχόμεθα οὖν καθ' ὥραν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ οἶδαμεν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ὑπὸ τινος, πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, κ.τ.λ.

If this passage is compared with that from Eusebius on Isa. xl. 10, quoted on p. 70, it will be seen how closely parallel it is. Comp. the *καθ' ὥραν* of Clement with the *καθ' ἥν* of Eusebius, and notice the *ἥξει* common to the two. Observe, further, the use of Heb. x. 23, and compare with the passage from Eusebius on Isa xl. 5, quoted on p. 71. Some words from Heb. x. 25 are there given. Out of the same verse, comp. *καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὅσα βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσιν τὴν ἡμέραν* with Clement here. This confirms the conjecture that Eusebius was used, and suggests that the two epistles bearing Clement's name are really by the same author.

The coincidences given above cannot, for the most part, be explained by the supposition that Clement was copied. They can all of them be explained by the conjecture that Clement was the copyist. It is difficult to understand on what principles of fair criticism this conclusion can be resisted. It is not, however, any part of our plan to argue the question now. These things must be added to the body of evidence which is growing up, the cumulative force of which will

have to be felt. We have mentioned them at this time merely because we came across the Epistles of Clement in Isa. xl., to which chapter we also traced the *Evang. Thom.* We wished to confirm the notion that an interest for some reason was felt in this chapter, and the inference that Prov. xxx. 4 was used very much as we have supposed.

It must be observed that we were taken to Isa. xl. by the word *καμάρα*, to which the writer of the *Evang. Thom.* seems to have paid special attention.

(6.) Before we leave this gospel we must recall to the recollection of our readers the fact that there is a peculiar interest belonging to the word *ἐναλλάξ*, in that it is found in Clement's i. 12 (where it is used in the sense of "crosswise," "in opposite directions," *vid. sup.* p. 23), and forms one link of connection between this section and those pages of the *Evang. Thom.* which we have just been discussing.

This section tells the story of Rahab's reception of the spies, and gives the conversation she had with them. In the course of her conversation she uses some words to which the editors have specially called attention. Lightfoot writes: "Cotelier observes that Clement seems to have had in his copy of the LXX. (Josh. ii. 9) the words *καὶ κατέπτησσαν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ἅφ' ὕμῶν*, which are wanting in all the best MSS., though supplied in the Complutensian edition, and represented in the original Hebrew." It does not seem unfair to argue from this circumstance that Clement was perfectly familiar with the chapter (Josh. ii.) in which the story of Rahab and the spies is recorded. How, then, are we to account for the fact that the conversations which are carried on in Clement's i. 12 are not in the words of the sacred narrative?

We saw not long ago an instance of exactly the same kind of thing in i. 43, which, while it tells the story of Aaron's rod, adds sundry embellishments of Clement's own. If any one chooses to believe this adorning of the sacred narrative in i. 43 to be nothing else than jesting, he is most certainly justified in so doing. It is natural to ask whether § 12 is like § 43, not only in its departure from the simple narrative of Holy Scripture,—which is acknowledged,—but also in its seeming want of that gravity which is to be looked for in the writings of Clement of Rome.

Without going into a complete examination of Clement's language, some circumstances may be readily pointed out which may be thought to make § 12 in all respects the counterpart of § 43.

We have said in chap. iii. 15, p. 23, that Clement's use of the word ἐναλλάξ shows some coincidences with Diodorus' in lib. xvii. 33, p. 184.

This chapter could not fail to suggest the scriptural account of the taking of Jericho to any one who was on the look-out for something to parody or turn into jest. It opens with the words, τῶν δὲ κατασκόπων ἀπαγγειλάντων αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ. It says a great deal about the sounding of the trumpet and the shouting of opposing armies, shout answering to shout until the whole country resounded with the din. The language, τῶν δὲ σαλπικτῶν παρ' ἀμφοτέροις τὸ πολεμικὸν σημαίνοντων οἱ Μακεδόνες πρῶτοι συναλαλάξαντες βοὴν ἐξαίσιον ἐποίησαν, bears some resemblance to ὡς δὲ ἤκουσεν ὁ λαὸς τῶν σαλπικτῶν, ἠλάλαξε, ἠλάλαξε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἅμα ἀλαλαγμῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἰσχυρῷ. Josh. vi. 20. Nor is a reference to the capture of a city wanting here, for the closing words of c. 32 are, ὁ δ' Ἀλέξανδρος τὴν μὲν Ἰσσοὺν πόλιν ἀξιόλογον καταπληξάμενος ἐχειρώσατο. "Interim Alexander Issum, Ciliciæ urbem non ignobilem *formidine percussam*, occuparat." This chapter contains the word ἐναλλάξ. If it can be shown that Clement used Diodorus at this point, it cannot reasonably be doubted that it was done in jest.

The closing words of Clement's § 11 are, εἰς κρίμα καὶ εἰς σημείωσιν πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς γίνονται. The words of Diodorus immediately preceding the closing word of c. 32, given above, are : διὰ τῆς ἰδίας κρίσεως προεσήμαινον τοῖς βαρβάροις τὴν νίκην.

After one line in § 12, Clement has ἐκπεμφθέντων . . . κατασκόπων. Comp. with the opening words of c. 33 given above.

In the same sentence Clement writes : ἐξέπεμψεν ἄνδρας τοὺς συλληφόμενους αὐτούς, ὅπως συλληφθέντες κ.τ.λ. Light-foot, on τοὺς συλληψ., calls attention to the construction. In c. 32, p. 183, Diodorus writes : συλληφθεὶς καὶ δεθεὶς εἰς φυλακὴν παρεδόθη, and after two lines : Παρμενίωνα μὲν μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως ἀπέστειλε προκαταληψόμενον κ.τ.λ. On the preceding page we find ἐζήτει στρατηγὸν ἀξιόχρεων τὸν διαδεξόμενον κ.τ.λ., and on p. 187 ἐξέπεμψεν ἕνα τῶν φίλων Λεοννάτον, καταπαύσοντα τὴν

ταραχὴν, καὶ παραμυθησόμενον τὰς κ.τ.λ., and after three lines προσαγορεῦσαι. For the use of these same passages in *Peregrin.* 12, *vid. infr.* § 4. 2. α.

Clement also writes in § 12: καὶ προσέθεντο αὐτῇ δοῦναι σημεῖον. Lightfoot remarks that προσέθεντο “is used in imitation of the LXX. diction.” This is probable enough, and it is none the less probable that the προσέθεντο of Diodorus in the last six lines of c. 32 suggested its use; at any rate, it is there exactly found. Now, when we add to these coincidences ἐναλλάξ, used both by Clement and Diodorus, it seems unreasonable to deny the use of Diodorus. If this is conceded, it would seem to follow that § 12 is nothing else than jest. The use of ὑπερῶν and στέγος, and of the words “which are wanting in all the best mss.,” is at once thus capable of easy explanation, *vid. supr.* pp. 23, 73.

In c. 33, a little above ἐναλλάξ, Diodorus has τοσοῦτον πλῆθος βελῶν, ὅστε διὰ τὴν πυκνότητα τῶν βαλλομένων ἀλλήλοις συγκρουόντων. Comp. ἐν δὲ τῷ ὅχλῳ συγκρούσας ἡ ὑδρία ἐρράγη, *Evang. Thom.* A 11, p. 143, a few lines only above ἐναλλάκτης. In B 10 the words are, πορευόμενος δὲ συνετρίβη ἡ ὑδρία αὐτοῦ. Comp. further, with both, κατόπιν τοῦ τῶν κηρύκων ἀγῶνος, and after three lines, ἐγὼ δὲ ὀλίγων ἤκουσα ὑπὸ πλῆθους τῶν περιεστώτων· εἶτα φοβηθεὶς μὴ συντριβεῖν ἐν τοσαύτῃ τύρβῃ. *Peregrin.* 32. Κατόπιν and ἀγῶνας are in Diodorus’ context. A further use of those pages of Diodorus in *Peregrinus* will be shown presently.

§ 4. There is some confirmation of the reality of the connection just pointed out, between Clement and Diodorus, in the use of the word ἐναλλάξ, to be found in a treatise called *De Prænotione ad Epigenem Liber*,¹ and which bears the name of Galen.

¹ “Exstat in edit. Ald. P. III. p. 135, in gr. Basil. P. III. p. 451, in Chart. to. VIII. p. 829, in vi. Junt. cl. iv. f. 213.

“Ad Posthumum de prænotione male inscripserunt editores. Est liber omnino memorabilis, in quo Galenus, qua felicitate in præsagiis usus sit, fuse enarrat, et historias plane mirabiles refert. Scripsit hunc librum editis jam libris de art. med. et de libr. propr. Citat in eo libros xv. de pulsibus.

“CORDEX latinus est in bibl. r. Paris. n. 6865.

“INTERPRETES sunt Jul. Martian. Rota et Jo. Guintherius, cujus versionem Charterius emendavit.

“EDITIONES Galeni de præsagitura, Ge. Valla interpr. prodiit c. aliis Galeni et alior. Græcor. Ven. 1498 f. Prodiit etiam Leonh. Jacchino interpr. c. explanationibus. 1540, 4to.” Ackermann. *Liter. Hist.* in Kühn, vol. i. p. cxlvi.

This treatise comes before us for examination under rather peculiar circumstances. In the *Contemporary Review* for May 1878, in an article entitled "Illustrations of the Acts from Recent Discoveries," Canon Lightfoot calls particular attention to "a striking coincidence" between Galen in the above-named treatise and S. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles.

Galen (§ 2, p. 612) speaks of a certain Sergius Paulus, a proconsul and student of Aristotle. Having introduced him as Sergius ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, Galen, throughout the remainder of the treatise, drops the first name, and calls him simply Paulus. Canon Lightfoot considers (p. 290) this dropping of the name of Sergius in favour of Paulus, to be a justification of the conjecture that would identify the Paulus, the proconsul of a certain Cyprian¹ inscription, as the Sergius Paulus of Acts xiii.

Canon Lightfoot takes special notice of the words ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, which are the very words which S. Luke uses of Saul of Tarsus, in Acts xiii. 9, in the very place, that is, where he is speaking of Sergius Paulus. It is interesting to see how *this* coincidence is dealt with. Canon Lightfoot says: "Not the wildest venture of criticism could so trample on chronology as to maintain that the author of the Acts borrowed from these treatises of Galen; and conversely, I have no desire to suggest that Galen borrowed from S. Luke. But if so, the facts are a warning against certain methods of criticism which find favour in this age." Will any one say that the two reasons which Canon Lightfoot gives are sufficient to prove that the coincidence in question is accidental? and yet, if it is to have even the smallest value as "a warning," its accidental character must be placed beyond doubt. We quite agree with the Canon, that it would be ridiculous to argue that the writer of the Acts borrowed from Galen. The alternative is, however, not that which he mentions. No one, we should imagine, would "desire to suggest," or even dream of suggesting, that Galen wrote his treatises (or any one of them) as parodies of Holy Scripture, which *De Prænotione* must be if its ὁ καὶ Παῦλος was borrowed from the Acts. The real alternative is very obvious. Fabricius¹ says that there are

¹ ΕΠΙ· ΠΑΤΑΟΥ· [ΑΝΘ] ΤΗΑΟΥ. Cesnola's *Cyprus*, p. 425.

170 works extant under the name of Galen. Of these, only 82 or 83 treatises, and some 18 books of *commentaries* upon Hippocrates, are thought to be genuine. The remaining treatises are considered to be either doubtful, or certainly spurious. It is therefore very natural, and we think only right, to ask whether the treatise which contains this "striking coincidence" with the Acts, is really from the pen of Galen. This question, however, Canon Lightfoot does not ask. Having started two theories with respect to the coincidence in question, which condemn themselves, he assumes its accidental character, and then holds the *facts* up as a "warning." If coincidences may be discarded as accidental in this summary fashion, it is not easy to understand how they can be used, as Canon Lightfoot does use them, to support certain ancient documents.

In the *Contemporary Review* for May 1877, there is an article on "Supernatural Religion," also by Canon Lightfoot. In this (p. 1134) he brings forward three coincidences between Tatian's *Apology* and the Gospel of S. John, and argues from them that Tatian was certainly acquainted with the Gospel. He is at much pains, therefore, to show their force. The first of these (πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός)—like the one with which we are concerned, in that it consists of three words only—"he should not," he says, "have regarded as decisive if it had stood alone." It is, however, evident that he thought it an excellent reason for a close examination of Tatian's *Apology*. The third, he says, "is all the more remarkable, because the words are extremely simple in themselves, and it is their order and adaptation which gives a character of uniqueness to the expression." One cannot but feel that these words apply with almost equal force to the coincidence (ὁ καὶ Παῦλος) between Galen and S. Luke.

Canon Lightfoot then goes on to speak of the value of *cumulative* evidence, and he writes: "It is only necessary to point to the enormous improbability that any two writers should exhibit accidentally three such resemblances as in the passages quoted, and the inference will be plain," p. 1136. Our contention is, that the coincidences which we bring for-

¹ *Lib.* iv. 17, p. 528 sq., Hamb. 1717. *Vid.* Acker. *Liter. Hist.* Kühn, vol. i. p. xviii.; Smith's *Dict. Gr. Rom. Biogr.* art. "Galenus," p. 210, ed. 1846.

ward must be dealt with on precisely the same principles as those which Canon Lightfoot applies to the resemblances which he brings forward for the purpose of showing that Tatian was acquainted with S. John's gospel. Coincidences are not to be put aside, because we may happen to "have no desire to suggest" that one writer borrowed from another. Their significance, their individual value, their cumulative force, must be considered.

We have here before us one coincidence between Galen and S. Luke, which is confessedly an important one. A single moment's reflection, however, supplies us with a second of no less importance. S. Luke, after introducing Saul of Tarsus as *ὁ καὶ Παῦλος*, thenceforward drops the first name and uses Paul only. Galen does the same thing with Sergius *ὁ καὶ Παῦλος*. This is an important coincidence, for Canon Lightfoot, as we have seen, draws an important inference from the dropping of the name.

We thus have two very noticeable coincidences between Galen and S. Luke. The *cumulative* force of three, it seems, should prove that one writer borrowed from another. Now, will any one say that the two which have been pointed out will not justify even a "sober" critic in casting a suspicious eye along the pages of Galen's treatise?

When we read Canon Lightfoot's article of May 1878, and observed the second coincidence with S. Luke which he does not mention, as well as the first which he does, we did not jump to the conclusion that the treatise containing them was a forgery; neither were we disposed rashly to assume that these startling coincidences with S. Luke had accidentally arisen; but we thought that an examination of the treatise was called for, and that possibly other things of like character would be found. Canon Lightfoot seemed to challenge the examination of the coincidence which he produced, and we determined to make that examination.

It would not, however, have been made at this time, if it had not been for one circumstance. On further reflection, it occurred to us that Clement, in his *Ep.* i. 65, has a *καί*, which is just as noticeable as Galen's. We therefore conjectured that Galen's treatise, if a fraud, would be found to be closely connected with the writings which we have specially in hand,

and that, in all probability, the very passages and pages (or some of them), which we knew to be used in those writings, would serve to expose its true character. How far this expectation was justified it is our business to show.

(1.) We shall first of all point out the use of *καί*, on which the conjecture rested. Clement writes :

τοὺς δὲ ἀπεσταλμένους ἀφ' ἡμῶν Κλαύδιον Ἐφρηβον καὶ Οὐαλέριον Βίτωνα σὺν καὶ Φορτουνάτῳ ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ χαρᾶς ἐν τάχει ἀναπέμψατε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὅπως θάττον τὴν εὐκταίαν καὶ ἐπιποθήτην ἡμῖν εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμόνοιαν ἀπαγγέλλωσιν εἰς τὸ τάχιον καὶ ἡμᾶς χαρῆναι περὶ τῆς εὐσταθείας ὑμῶν. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν καὶ μετὰ πάντων πανταχῇ τῶν κεκλημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.—i. 65.

On σὺν καὶ Φορτ. Lightfoot says: "For the position of *καί* comp. Phil. iv. 3, μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος (quoted by Laurent, p. 425)." We observe that S. Paul in verse 1 uses the word ἐπιπόθητος. It is not found again either in the LXX. or N. T., and not very often elsewhere. Clement, we see, uses it almost directly after σὺν καὶ Φορτουνάτῳ. Now turn to the only mention of Fortunatus in the N. T. in 1 Cor. xvi. 17. In ver. 11, S. Paul says: προπέμψατε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν εἰρήνῃ. Lightfoot quotes these words in illustration of Clement's ἐν εἰρήνῃ . . . ἀναπέμψατε. In ver. 23, S. Paul writes: ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. μεθ' ὑμῶν. Comp. with Clement. There is a little difference. Why? S. Paul ends Phil. iv. with ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. On the next words of Clement, Lightfoot quotes 1 Cor. i. 2, σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ. Why does not Clement write σὺν πᾶσι? The μετὰ πάντων of Phil. iv. supplies the answer. The natural, if not the necessary, inference from the foregoing coincidences is that Clement consulted both 1 Cor. xvi. and Phil. iv., and borrowed *καί* from before his own name in Phil. iv., and then in jest tacked it on to Fortunatus.

(2.) In *De Prænot.* 2, p. 612, Galen writes :

ὀλίγον δ' ὕπερον ἐπισκεψόμενοι τὸν Εὐδῆμον ἀφίχοντο Σέργιός τε ὁ καὶ (καὶ ὁ,¹ Kühn) Παῦλος, ὅς οὐ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον ὑπαρχος ἐγένετο

¹ "The words stand Σέργιός τε καὶ ὁ Παῦλος in Kühn and other earlier printed editions which I have consulted, but they are quoted Σέργιός τε ὁ καὶ Παῦλος by

τῆς πόλεως, καὶ Φλάβιος ὑπατικός μὲν ὢν ἤδη καὶ αὐτός, ἐσπευκώς¹ δὲ περὶ τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους φιλοσοφίαν, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, οἷς διηγησάμενος ἅπαντα ὁ Εὐδῆμος τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, λυπεῖν ἔφη τὴν σήμερον ἐσομένην πρόβ-
ρησιν ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος παροξυσμοῦ, παραφυλάττειν δ' ὅπως ἀποβήσεται το
γενομένου δὲ κακείου περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὥραν τοῖς προγεγενημένοις ὁ μὲν
Εὐδῆμος ἐθαύμαζε τε καὶ τοῖς ἐπισκοπούμενοις αὐτὸν ἅπασιν ἐδήλου τὰς
ἐμὰς προβήσεις. ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι σχεδὸν ἅπαντες οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων
τὸλιν ἀξιωματί τε καὶ παιδείᾳ προύχοντες.

It appears from this that Sergius was not the only student of Aristotle, and but one, and not at that time the chief one, of the distinguished company drawn to Galen by his wonderful predictions.

With Galen's last words, compare ἄρτι δὲ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἔπειθεν ἀντάρασθαι ὅπλα Ῥωμαίοις ἄρτι δὲ ἄνδρα παιδείᾳ καὶ ἀξιώματι προύχοντα. *Peregrin.* 19. Truly nothing can be more suggestive than this coincidence with *Peregrinus*. It inclines one more than ever to suppose the coincidence with S. Luke to be mere parody.

Galen's ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος gives emphasis to the preceding ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, and at the same time explains how the various reading may have crept in accidentally or otherwise.

Galen's expression τὰ κατ' ἐμέ is Pauline. Comp. Col. iv. τὰ κατ' ἐμέ πάντα γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικός, ver. 7; ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα γνῶ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ver. 8. Now, observe, Galen on the same p. 612 (after three lines) writes: ὡς οὖν ἐγνώρισέ μου τὸ ὄνομα καὶ τοῦτ'² αὐτὸ τῷ τε Παύλῳ διηγήσατο καὶ μετὰ τὴν πεῖραν ἔφη παρακαλεῖν³ με, δεῖξάι τε καὶ αὐτῷ. Ver. 10 of the Colossians

Wetstein and others. I do not know on what authority this latter reading rests, but the change in order is absolutely necessary for the sense."—Light. note, p. 292. Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of S. Paul*, vol. i. p. 177, n. ed. 1859, quote the passage from Galen, and read ὁ καὶ in silence though using Kühn's edition. Alford also notices the coincidence, and reads ὁ καὶ without remark.

¹ ἑσπουδακώς has been suggested from Galen's ἑσπουδακώς δὲ καὶ περὶ τὴν Ἀρ. φιλ. a little below. See next note.

² τ. ἀ. and ἀ. τ. in the N.T. are found (with one exception, 2 Pet. i. 5) only in S. Paul's Epistles. Galen has ἀ. τ. in § 5, p. 630: ὅπως ἀκουσθῶσιν ἀ. τ. μόνον. Comp. μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, δ' καὶ ἑσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, Gal. ii. 10. See preceding note. See also note next but one following.

³ Comp. "When the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought (παρεκάλουν) that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath."—Acts xiii. 42.

runs: "Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you, and Marcus, ἀνεψίός to Barnabas," etc. (Hesych.: ἀνεψιοί, ἀδελφῶν υἱοί). Galen after one line says: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Βάρβαρος ὁ θεῖος τοῦ βασιλεύοντος Λευκίου, κατὰ τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν ὀνομαζομένην ὄντος ὑπάρχου, ἐδεῖτο τοῦ μαθήματος καὶ αὐτός, ὥσπερ ὁ Παῦλος. Can it be possible that Galen's Barbarus is in truth Barnabas? His sentence would then be equivalent to the Barnabas and Paul of the Acts. Thomas M., under τίθην, treats of ἀνεψίός among other relationships. His remarks might have supplied the whole of one of the short pseudo-Helladian excerpts, except the following words: καὶ θεῖον μὲν ὀνομάζουσι τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀδελφόν. Phot. Bibl. 279, p. 530. Compare with Galen, whose name is mentioned two or three lines above the words now given from the excerpt.

Galen uses the expression τὰ κατ' ἐμέ again on p. 647: καὶ μέντοι καὶ αὐτὸς ἔτοιμος ἦν, ὥσπερ ὁ τε Σεβῆρος, τὸ μνηῦσαι τ. κ. ἐ. τῇ τε κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ὄντι Μάρκῳ Αὐρηλίῳ Ἀντωνίνῳ αὐτοκράτορι. Λεύκιος γὰρ κ.τ.λ. Comp. Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάρους, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί· οὕτω, τὸ κατ' ἐμέ, πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι. Rom. i. 14, 15. Besides the general parallel, observe the βαρβάρους of the Romans and the Marcus and Lucius of Galen. The conjecture as to Barnabas and Barbarus just now hazarded would seem to be in some measure confirmed.

We turn now to Acts xiii. It begins: "Now there were (ἦσαν δέ) in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius—and Saul." Ver. 44 runs: "And the next Sabbath-day came σχεδὸν πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ." Comp. Galen's sentence (quoted p. 80): ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι σχεδὸν . . . ὁ δ' οὖν Βοηθός, ἀκηκοώς follow. Comp. also his Lucius. Μάρκον is the last word of Acts xii.

In ver. 8 we are told that Elymas withstood S. Paul, and sought to turn away (διαστρέψαι) the deputy from the faith; and in ver. 45, that the Jews, when they saw the multitudes that came together to hear the word (τὸν λόγον) of God, "were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul," etc. On p. 613 Galen says that one Antigenes ridiculed him, saying that they would know whom to

praise ὅταν¹ ἐκφερόμενον ἴδωσιν (the sick) Εὐδημον . . . ἀποστρέφων ἐνίοτε τὸν λόγον. In Acts v. 6, 9, ἐκφέρειν is used of Ananias and Sapphira when carried out for burial; and in ver. 15, ἐκφέρειν τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς is found.

In xiii. 12 it is said that when the deputy saw what was done (the fulfilment of S. Paul's words in the case of Elymas) he believed ἐκπλησσομένος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Κυρίου. So Galen, p. 614, says that when his first prophecy respecting Eudemus came true, men were amazed; but when his second also was fulfilled, ἅπαντες μὲν ἐξεπλάγησαν.

In Acts xii. 22 (the end of the chapter), S. Luke, speaking of Herod's death, says: ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφάνει, θεοῦ φανὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου. Galen, p. 618, says of Eudemus (obs.), when he was cured: οὐχ ὑπομένοντος μετρίως φθέγγεσθαι τοῦ φιλοσόφου, καθάπερ εἶωθεν. κεκραγότες δὲ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἡμᾶς τοὺς εἰσιόντας φίλους, ὡς ὁ Πύθιος Ἀπόλλων, διὰ τοῦ Γαληνοῦ στόματος κ.τ.λ.

Along the whole narrative, indeed, Galen appears to desire to play (in parody) the part of S. Paul, and to exaggerate and turn into ridicule those features of the apostle's character and writings the most easily assailable. Galen encounters opposition; he works cures which make a great stir, and give him a great name; he professes not to be careful of honour of this kind, and not to go about proclaiming his own medical prophecies and cures; he disclaims boasting, and then boasts; he says he will be silent upon the wonderful cure which had brought him the greatest fame, and then immediately describes it. The close of that part of the treatise, moreover, which deals with the cure of Eudemus shows several resemblances to the close of the Acts of the Apostles.

After one of his controversies, p. 628, Galen writes: ὁ Ἀλέξαν-

¹ Comp. the story of Ahab, Micaiah, and Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah in 1 Kings xxii. Comp. ver. 25: καὶ εἶπε Μιχαίας, ἰδοὺ σὺ ὄψῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, ὅταν εἰσέλθῃς ταμεῖον τοῦ ταμείου τοῦ κρυβῆναι ἐκεῖ (with ἀποστρέψατε immediately in the next verse), with Galen above in the text. Ver. 18 runs: "And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, Did I not tell thee ὅτι οὐ προφητεύει οὗτός μοι καλὰ, διότι ἀλλ' ἢ κακά;" and ver. 8: ἐγὼ μεμίσηκα αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐ λαλεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ καλὰ κ.τ.λ. In the pseudo-Helladian excerpts, p. 532, the following is found: διὸ καὶ ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων ὀργιζόμενος τῷ Κάλχαντι ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι τὴν βλασφημίαν περιφέρει, Μάντι, λίγων, κακῶν, καὶ αἰεί σοι φίλον τὰ κακὰ μαντεύεσθαι· καί· Ἐσθλὸν οὐδὲ πώποτε εἶπες, Hom. *Il.* i. 106 sq. This would readily suggest 1 Kings xxii. So J. Duport, *Hom. Gnomol.* 1660, p. 5. Two or three lines below in the excerpt ἐκφέρουσι is found. Comp. with Galen. See note, p. 85.

δρος . . . ἔφη . . . τοῖς διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων φαινομένοις πιστεύειν ἡμᾶς δεῖν. ἀκούσας δ' ἐγὼ ταῦτα, καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐχωρίσθην ἐν μόνον φθεγζάμενος, ὡς ἐσφάλην οἰόμενος εἰς τοὺς ἀγροικοπυρρῶνείους ἵκειν κ.τ.λ. Comp. Acts xxviii. 25 sq.: ἀσύμφωνοι δὲ ὄντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀπελύοντο, εἰπόντος τοῦ Παύλου ῥῆμα ἐν, "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive." Compare the latter as well as the earlier part of this passage. When Galen had gone away, the rest had some controversy among themselves. So, in ver. 29, it is said, that "when Paul had said these things, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves." Galen tells us that numbers of persons came together to the same place to hear him discourse upon various medical matters: καὶ μέχρι δὲ νῦν, οὐδὲν¹ ἐτόλμησέ τις ἀντειπεῖν αὐτοῖς ἐτῶν ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ γεγονότων ἰέ. So, in ver. 30, it is said, "And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." To make the picture more complete, Galen says, that in consequence of a desire which Boethus had expressed to possess his notes or commentaries, he dictated to the scribes both what he had shown and what he had said, μὴ προοράμενος εἰ μέλλει δώσειν αὐτὰ πολλοῖς, which is, in all respects, true of S. Paul. We have just seen a coincidence between Galen and the writer of *Peregrinus*. We cannot forget that the latter makes himself merry with the Epistles of

¹ The sources of Galen's language as well as of his ideas may be easily traced. Phil. i. 12 contains an example of τὰ κατ' ἐμέ. (See p. 80 and note 2.) In ver. 5 we find ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν; in ver. 6: αὐτὸ τοῦτο (see note 2, p. 80); in ver. 14: τολμᾷ ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν. Comp. with Galen. He immediately proceeds: καίτοι γε διαβουλεομένων γε πολλῶν ἀντειπεῖν, ὅπως ἀκουσθῶσιν αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον (see note 2, p. 80), ὡς ἀντειρήκασιν, οὐ μὴν τολμώντων γε εἰς κρίσιν ἐπὶ φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν ἀγαγεῖν τὰ γραφέντα. Comp. τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν . . . κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδικῶν, καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγίων; 1 Cor. vi. 1; also, "Yet Michael the archangel, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ (obs.) διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησε κρίσιν ἐπιενεργεῖν βλασφημίας," Jude 9; εἰς κρίσιν, Jude 6. Just above, in Galen, we observe τὴν φωνήν, and after one line τὴν ἀφωνίαν ἐργάζοιτο καὶ τῶν παραφθεγζαμένων ὅποτε ἰδείκνυον ταῦτα πάντων ἐλεγχθέντων, . . . ἐν τάχει γράφειν. Comp. πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν, Jude 3; καὶ ἐξελέγχει πάντας τοὺς ἀσιβεῖς αὐτῶν περὶ πάντων κ.τ.λ., Jude 15. Ἐλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχιν ἰδίας παρανομίας. ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ φωνῇ φθεγζάμενον, 2 Pet. ii. 16 (parallel to Jude 11).

Ignatius, as the former may perhaps be here thought to do with those of S. Paul.

Then, further, when Galen's story of the cure of Eudemus is carefully considered, it seems impossible to suppose it to be written seriously. It reads very much as if there were in it some little substratum of truth gathered from Galen's books, with embellishments of the writer's own, after the fashion of *Peregrinus*. It is amusing to remark the way in which the marvels of the cure are "piled up" and emphasized. Thus, on p. 614, we find Εὐδῆμον ἐξηκοστὸν καὶ τρίτον ἔτος ἄγοντα, τρεῖς ἔχοντα τεταρταίους ἐν μέσῳ χειμῶνος, θεραπεύειν ὑπισχρεῖται Γαληνός (these last words may be borne in mind), or as Eudemus describes himself, as γέροντα χειμῶνος ὥρα κάμνοντα τρισὶ τεταρταίοις, p. 619. We are reminded of Clement's embellishments of the simple narratives of Holy Scripture, e.g. in i. 12 and in i. 43, and of the way in which Clement piles up his sentences when, at any rate, there *may be* a joke in hand—e.g. σὺν καὶ Φορτουνάτῳ ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ χαρᾶς ἐν τάχει κ.τ.λ., i. 65, *vid. sup.* p. 79.

(3.) Curiously enough, Galen gives in this same treatise an illustration of Clement's i. 43 (the sealing of the rods).

A son of Boethus, Galen says, p. 635, was ill. His case, from a medical point of view, was peculiar; for one day he would be sick and the next well, or by night he would be feverish, while by day his pulse would be regular and low. There was nothing either in the quality or the quantity of the food provided for him to account for the strange symptoms. Galen therefore suggested that the boy had secret stores of food, to which he applied himself. Accordingly Galen (p. 636) τὴν μητέρα τοῦ παιδὸς ὑποσχομένην ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸν φυλάξαι ἐπέστησε φύλακα παρακαθημένην τε δι' ὅλης τῆς ἡμέρας, ἀποκωλύουσάν τε τοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἐκεῖνον εἰσιόντας, κατὰ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ κοιμωμένου, ἀποκεκλεισμένον ἔνδοθεν ἀκριβῶς ἀπ' αὐτῆς. Four days elapsed, but there was no improvement in the symptoms. The boy was brought out of the house which he had formerly occupied to that of Boethus. Those persons who were met with by the way joined the procession! One of those persons, of course, was Epigenes, who always turned up most appropriately to be the witness to Galen's triumphs. An irresistibly comic account is given of the new chamber, the mother's bed, the

little bed for the son, and the seats for Boethus and Galen to sit in solemn conclave upon the mysterious case of this small boy, who was suspected of eating more than was good for him from some secret store. No less amusing is the conversation which went on. Galen, however, learned ὅπως ὅταν εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ πορευομένη κλείσῃ τὸν οἶκον, εἴτα ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας εἰς γλωττόκομον ἐμβάλλουσα τὴν κλεῖν κατασημήνηται, and he concluded that the boy took this opportunity of devouring his concealed stores. A regular search was instituted in the bed and under it. This was for a long time fruitless, and the laugh was against Galen—τί, φησὶν, ὁ μάντις λέγει; one thing remained unsearched—ἣν δὲ τοῦτο παντελῶς σμικρὸν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ταραντινίδος ἐπικείμενον τῇ καθέδρᾳ. Galen seems to mean by this a sort of nightcap, for, on p. 631, he says that a certain woman covered her body with clothes, ἄλλῃ δὲ τινι μικρῇ (obs. the use with dim., *vid. sup.* p. 61) ταραντινιδίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔκειτο καθάπερ οἱ χρῆζοντες ὕπνου. Galen lifted the “nightcap” and shook it, and there fell from it a piece of bread. “Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.”

Γλωσσόκομον¹ is used twice in the N. T., both times by S. John, with reference to Judas: καὶ τὸ γλωσσοκόμον εἶχε, καὶ τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν, xii. 6, and ἐπεὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχεν ὁ Ἰούδας, xiii. 29; comp. with Galen. This receptacle contained the key, comp. καὶ ὅτι τὴν κλεῖδαν εἶχεν ὁ Καϊάφας. *Evangel. Nicod.*, quoted p. 57. Except that it would have spoiled the joke, one does not see why the mother should not have done the same as Caiaphas. We need hardly be indebted to Galen for “a surgical operation” to enable us to see through this transparent jesting. As a finishing touch, we may mention that the name of this small boy, the subject of so much medical and parental anxiety, so carefully put under lock and key and seal, bore the name of Cyril—shall we say, after Cyril of Jerusalem? (*vid. sup.* p. 55).

(4.) We shall give now the illustration of Clement’s use of ἐναλλάξ, which was promised.

Galen, p. 656, says that certain physicians outrage their art

¹ In the pseudo-Helladian excerpts, p. 532, an account is given of γλωσσοκομῆτον, which appears to be indebted to Hesychius. Shortly afterwards Hesychius notices γνάφαλλον and γνάφαλος. Here in Galen τὸ γνάφαλλον is one of the things searched.

ὥσπερ καὶ τοὺς φιλοσόφους φιλοσοφίαν, οἳ γε μηδενὸς ἰδιώτου βέλτιον βιοῦντες ὀνομάζουσιν αὐτοὺς ὀνόματι σεμνῶ τῷ τῆς φιλοσοφίας. Comp. οὐκ αὐτοὶ βλασφημοῦσι τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς; Jas. ii. 7. Lower down in the same chapter S. James speaks of Rahab, "who sent out the messengers another way." It will be remembered that Clement tells this story in *Epr.* i. 12, and that he writes: καὶ ἐξέπεμψεν ἄνδρας τοὺς συλληφόμενους αὐτούς, and after half a dozen lines: ὁδὸν ὑποδεικνύουσα αὐτοῖς ἐναλλάξ. Galen (who is here speaking of one Sextus, who was sick of a fever) goes on immediately to mention the malice of the physicians: πεμπόντων τε δι' ὅλης ἡμέρας τοὺς γνωσομένους τε καὶ ἀγγέλλοντας αὐτοῖς τὸ γενησόμενον. They did not know, he says, exactly what had been predicted as to τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς κρίσεως. When they heard of an accession of fever about the seventh hour, they mocked: καὶ φανερῶς ἐπιχαίροντες ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀπαντᾶσιν ἔλεγον κερτομοῦντες ὡς ἡ θαυμαστὴ μαντεία τοῦ Γαληνοῦ κατὰ τὸνναντίον ἀπέβη. γενομένης μέντοι τῆς κρίσεως, ὡς προειρήκειν κατὰ τὴν προτεραίαν (ἔφασαν ἐπομένην ἐναλλάξ) ἐτρέποντο πάντες αἰσχυρόμενοι, καὶ ταῦτα τῆς προγνώσεως οὐδὲν ἐχούσης θαυμαστόν, ὡς ἐδειξά σοι. We observe here, then, a very apt example of the construction to which Lightfoot calls attention (*vid. sup.* p. 74), followed presently, as in Clement, by ἐναλλάξ.

Observe, in the next place, Galen's ἡ θαυμαστὴ μαντεία, followed by οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν; and compare the whole passage with the parallel quoted from Cyril of Jerusalem, on p. 55. This, a curious confirmation of the conjecture, that the joke about "the keys," found in Galen and elsewhere, takes its rise from Cyril. *Peregrin.* 11 we know to be indebted to the same place of Cyril, and we consequently conclude the τὴν θαυμαστὴν σοφίαν there in *Peregrinus* (*vid. sup.* p. 47) to be equivalent to Galen's ἡ θαυμ. μαντ. here. Here, on p. 657, as there, the writing and expounding of books is spoken of; here, on p. 655, we find οὐδὲν κινεῖν; there, in the beginning of § 12: πάντα ἐκίνουν. In *Peregrin.* 11, again, is the τὸν μέγαν γοῦν commented upon on pp. 48, 49. We conclude, therefore, the title of μάντις assumed by Galen here, as well as elsewhere, to be taken from Soph. *El.* 1499 (*vid. sup.* p. 66, note). In the account of the boy Cyril he is often so called, and the words μάντις ὢν are found. This receives some confirmation from

the fact that *El.* 1481 runs: καὶ μάντις ἂν ἄριστος ἐσφάλλου πάλαι; while here in Galen, p. 655, we read: ὡς οὐκ ἂν σφαλείην ἐν τῇ προῤῥήσει, with μάντιν just below. The connection between *Soph. El.* 1499 and *Peregrinus* is thus to some extent confirmed,—a matter of some importance, in consideration of the way in which the lines of Sophocles were reached (*vid. sup.* p. 66, note).

The connection which has now been pointed out between Galen and Cyril of Jerusalem in “the keys,” naturally leads us to open once more Clement’s i. 43 (the sealing of the keys and rods). If we do, we find that there, in Clement, the foreknowledge (προέγνω) of Moses is in hand, as also the πρόγνωσις τελεία (beginning of § 44: τέλειος ἐν προγνώσει, is found in Cyril, p. 92) of the apostles; and here, the πρόγνωσις of Galen. There, Clement begins one sentence with οὐ προέγνω, and the next with μάλιστα ἤδει; here, Galen begins one with σὺ δὲ . . . ἔγνως, and the next with οὐ γὰρ ἤδεσαν: both Galen and Clement speaking of the forecasting of future events. There, Clement has τῷ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματι; here, Galen ὀνόματι σεμνῷ. Above, on p. 57, the opening words of § 43 are given, which may be compared with Galen’s αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ προῤῥησις, ὡς ἔφην, εἰ καὶ θαυμαστῇ τοῖς πολλοῖς τοῦτοις ἰατροῖς ἔταξεν, ἀλλ’ οὐ τοιαύτη γε κατ’ ἀλήθειαν ἦν, here, on p. 657. The connection is far closer than appears at first sight; for just as Clement says that surprise was needless, for Moses had supplied a precedent in the sacred books, so Galen, that certain prognostications of his were divested of all marvel, inasmuch as he had only foretold what was plainly laid down in the books of Hippocrates.

Galen would thus seem to be in contact with Clement, both in i. 43 through “the keys,” and in i. 12 through ἐναλλάξ.

(5.) But now a curious fact appears. It is no less profitable to turn to Diodorus for the illustration of Galen than to Clement, who himself seems to have been indebted to Diodorus (*vid. sup.* p. 74).

If our readers will refer to p. 74, they will see various examples bearing upon the “construction” to which attention has been directed from Diodorus, xvii. 33, p. 184, and the immediate neighbourhood. The word ἐναλλάξ is there used. Diodorus writes: ἡ μὲν μάχη, διὰ τὰς τῶν ἀγωνιζομένων ἀρετάς,

ἀμφίδοξον εἶχε τὴν τῶν ὅλων κρίσιν· ἔταλαντεύετο γὰρ δεῦρο καὶ κείσε τῆς τροπῆς ἐναλλάξ γινομένης. Comp. with Galen above. Just below, Diodorus has προετρέποντο. Comp. Galen's ἐτρέποντο. A little above, in Diodorus, is ἀπήντα, and just above ἐναλλάξ is καταπροτερῆσαι or προτερῆσαι (v. l.). Ἐναλλάξ is used several times by Diodorus; and this last verb, or the noun formed from it, appears almost always in close company with it (comp. Galen's προτεραίαν). So in *lib.* xx. 13, p. 415, Diodorus writes: ἀλλ' οἶμαι τὸ δαιμόνιον ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες τοῖς ὑπερῆφάνως διαλογιζομένοις τὸ τέλος τῶν κατελπισθέντων εἰς τὸυναντίον μετατίθῃσιν, and after one line: ἡ τύχη δὲ ἐναλλάξ τὰ προτερήματα προτερήσας. Comp. again with Galen.

A singular illustration of the mysterious connection which seems to exist between Galen's treatise and *Peregrinus* may here be pointed out. Comp. τότε δὴ καὶ συλληφθεὶς ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὁ Πρωτεύς ἐπέπεσεν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον with ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν ἐδέδετο after one line, and presently ὧν ἡκόν τινες τῶν Χριστιανῶν στελλόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ, βοηθήσοντες, καὶ ξυναγορεύσοντες, καὶ παραμυθησάμενοι τὸν ἄνδρα, *Peregrin.* 12, with the very words from Diodorus, quoted on pp. 74, 75, for their bearing upon Clement's "construction" (τοὺς συλληφόμενους) in i. 12, for which Galen has supplied a parallel. Galen and *Peregrinus* thus meet in Diodorus. A few lines above, in *Peregrinus*, we remark: καὶ ἔωθεν μὲν εὐθὺς ἦν ὁρᾶν . . . οἱ δὲ ἐν τέλει αὐτῶν καὶ συνεκάθευδον ἔνδον μετ' αὐτοῦ. With these words, and with those just given, comp. ὅπως καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ κοιμηθείην, ἥκέ τις καλῶν ἡμᾶς ἄρτι λύχνων ἡμμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος στελλόμενος. ὥς δὲ τριῶν ὄντων τῶν ἔωθεν τε καὶ περὶ τὴν ἑω ἑωρακότων αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ., here in Galen, p. 658.

We may, however, draw the connection between Galen and Diodorus much closer, and in a very singular manner.

We began our notice of p. 656 by speaking of certain physicians, who, in Galen's judgment, outraged their medical art. He says: ὑμῖν δὲ τοῖς φίλοις ὅσοι κατεγνώκατε τῆς ἱατρικῆς τέχνης ἐκ τῆς τούτων ἀμαθίας, ἐπιδείκνυμι τὴν μὲν τέχνην ἀξίαν Ἀπόλλωνός τε καὶ Ἀσκληπιοῦ, τοὺς δὲ ἱατροὺς τούτους ὑβρίζειν αὐτήν ὥσπερ καὶ τοὺς φίλ. κ.τ.λ. (see p. 85). Galen lays stress upon τέχνην.

It happens that in Diodorus, xvii. 31, p. 183, just above the

examples of "construction" referred to above, there is a short medical statement. Alexander, we are told, was greatly distressed at the death of Memnon:—

ὥς δ' ἤκόν τινες (cf. the ὦν ἤκόν τινες just given out of *Peregrinus*) ἀπαγγέλλοντες τὴν τοῦ Μένωνος τελευτὴν (comp. Galen's ἀγγέλλοντες, *sup.* p. 86. The malicious physicians desired to hear of the death of Sextus). μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ εἰς ἀρρώστιαν βαρυτέραν ἐμπεσών, καὶ χαλεπῶ πάθει συνεχόμενος, συνεκάλεσε τοὺς ἰατρούς. τῶν μὲν οὖν ἄλλων ἕκαστος δυσχερῶς εἶχε πρὸς τὴν θεραπείαν, Φίλιππος δ' Ἀχαρνὰν τὸ γένος παραβόλοις καὶ συντόμοις θεραπείαις χρώμενος, ἐπηγγείλατο διὰ φαρμακείας λύσειν τὸν νόσον . . . ὁ μὲν ἰατρὸς δοὺς φάρμακον πιεῖν, καὶ συνεργὸν¹ λαβὼν τὴν φύσιν τοῦ κάμνοντος, καὶ τὴν τέχνην, εὐθύς ἀπήλλαξε τῆς νόσου τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον. οὗτος μὲν οὖν παραδόξως ἐκφυγὼν τὸν κίνδυνον, καὶ τὸν ἰατρὸν τιμήσας μεγαλοπρεπῶς, κατέταξεν αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς εὐνουστάτους τῶν φίλων.

On τέχνην (above) Wesseling notes: "Τύχην, *Steph.* margo cum *Venet. Vat. Reg.* 1," and he makes the following observation (which no doubt previous critics had often made in substance): "Etsi sæpe numero in medicis verum sit, quod de rebus humanis poeta, τύχη τὰ θνητῶν πράγματ', οὐκ εὐβουλία, injuriam tamen Philippo Acarnani scribæ insignem inferunt, cum fortunæ magis præsidio, quam arti hanc Alexandri curationem tribuunt. Sibi ergo habeant, τὴν τύχην, ego τὴν τέχνην medico non detraho." We venture to suggest that Galen took the τέχνην on which he lays stress from this source. (See p. 92.)

With the passage from Diodorus, comp. τὴν δ' Ἡραΐδα φασὶν ἀρρώστια περιπεσεῖν . . . χρωμένων δὲ αὐτῶν θεραπειαῖς . . . τὴν δὲ ἀπολυθεῖσαν τῆς νόσου . . . τῆς τύχης ὥσπερ ἐν δράμασι τὸ παράδοξον τῆς περιπετείας ἀγούσης εἰς ἔγκλημα. Excerpt (1st on *Hermaphrodites*, Herais), *Diod. Sic.*, *Phot. Bibl.* 244, and συνεκλήθη πλῆθος ἰατρῶν. καὶ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων οὐδεὶς ὑπισχεῖτο θεραπεύειν, φαρμακοπώλης δὲ τις ἐπαγγελλόμενος ὑγιάσειν ἔτεμε τὸν ἐπηρμένον τόπον . . . καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ὑγιοποιήσας διπλοῦν ἀπήτει τὸν μισθόν. Excerpt (2d on *Hermaphrodites*, Callo), *Bibl.* 244.

The use of the passage of Diodorus is thus pretty equally

¹ Comp. συνεργὸν ἔχων καὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος φύσιν, Excerpt (Diodorus), *Phot. Bibl.* 244, p. 384. Just above we find οὐχ ἔχοντες ἀξίόχρεον ἡγεμόνα, and soon after, on same page: τὸν διαδεξάμενον αὐτοῦ τὴν στρατηγίαν. In Diodorus, a little above, on p. 182, we observe: ἐξήτει στρατηγὸν ἀξίόχρεον, τὸν διαδεξόμενον τὴν τοῦ Μένωνος ἡγεμονίαν. The changes are after the manner of our writers; *vid. sup.* p. 74, where the same passage is quoted in another connection.

divided between these two excerpts. We shall show in due course that these excerpts are nothing else than filthy jokes founded on the desire of Herodes Atticus to cut through the Isthmus of Corinth.

We called attention on p. 84 to Galen's words: *θεραπεύειν ὑπισχνεῖται Γαλήνός, p. 614*. On p. 619 we find *τὴν γοῦν γεγενημένην λύσιν τοῦ νοσήματος, πέπεισμαι γὰρ ἤδη τελέως ὑγιαίνειν, ἐπαγγειλόμενος* with *ἀπήλλαξε* in the next line. Compare this last passage with Diodorus, and observe the blending of the two passages of Galen in the second excerpt. We shall hereafter show the "promise to heal" and the "double reward" of the excerpts to be taken from Apollodorus, to whose writings our authors would seem to have betaken themselves from the interest they felt in the Danaids—an interest shared, we may remark, also by Clement (*Ep. i. 6*).

On p. 619, among the words last given from Galen, are *ἀπήλλαξέ με*. Galen proceeds: *καταγελάμενος ὑπ' αὐτῶν, εἴ γε νομίζει γέροντα χειμῶνος ὥρα κάμνοντα τρισὶ τέταρταίους ἀπαλλάξειν*. In the first of the excerpts which we have just been using we are told Herais was brought before the judges that it might be determined whether she (he) should be restored to the husband. Herais was obliged to make certain revelations *ῥῆξαί τε φωνὴν δεινοπαθοῦσαν, εἴ τινες ἀναγκάζουσι συνοικεῖν ἀνδρὶ τὸν ἄνδρα*. These sentences might well have been written by the same hand.

We have, however, brought Galen's words forward mainly for the sake of reminding our readers that one of the jokes in the cure of Eudemus seems to lie in *τρισὶ τέταρταίους ἐν μέσῳ* (or *ὥρῳ*) *χειμῶνος*.

(6.) We made our first acquaintance with *Peregrinus* and the excerpts from Diodorus in those pages of Philo in which coincidences were found with several writings (*vid. sup. c. iii. 2, p. 27*). Let us turn to the first page of Philo, to which we then referred. Immediately above the *ἐλλόγμιος* of Philo and Clement it is said that Balak, among other things, *προεῖπε . . . φλογμὸν ἐν μέσῳ χειμῶνι*. This is exactly what Galen did if we take, as we may, *φλογμὸν* in a medical sense. In *Peregrin.* 44, soon after, that is, the words which make the coincidence with this very page of Philo, we find *τὸν φλογμὸν* (of fever) *οὐ φέροντα*. Lower down, and among the very words partly

given in c. iii. 2, p. 27, Philo writes : περιττοτέρας δὲ δωρεὰς ὑπισχνούμενοι. δελεασθεῖς δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἤδη προτεινομένοις, καὶ ταῖς μελλούσαις ἐλπίσι, καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα τῶν παρακαλούντων καταιδεσθεῖς, ἐνεδίδου, πάλιν προφασίζόμενος τὸ θεῖον, οὐκ ἐφ' ὑγιεῖ. τῇ γοῦν ὑστεραία παρσεκευάζετο τὴν ἔξοδον, ὁνείρατα διηγούμενος. Comp. κατὰ δὲ τὴν ὑστεραίαν ἔωθεν ἀφικόμενοι πρὸς αὐτόν, οὐδέπω παρόντων ἡμῶν, ἔδοσαν τὸ φάρμακον αἰδεσθέντος διηγῆσασθαι τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ λεγόμενα αὐτῷ καὶ ἅμα θεασάμενος μετ' ἐνστάσεως, ὡς ὑποσχομένους τοὺς ἀφικνουμένους ἰατροὺς ἅπαντας, ὁνῆσειν αὐτόν οὐ σμικρὰ τὴν τοῦ φαρμάκου προσφοράν, p. 610. Philo has θεασάμενον on the same page, and in the second line of the following page ὁνῆσεις γὰρ οὐδέν. Galen has a little above, on the same page, ἐν χειμῶνος ἀρχῇ; and Philo, as we have already seen, ἐν μέσῳ χειμῶνι. On the same page Galen has ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἀπεκρινάμην ἐγὼ τῷ κ.τ.λ.; Philo, in the next but one, οἷς ἀπεκρινάμην ταῦτά. On the same page Galen has εὐέλπιδες, and on the next τίνα προσδοκίαν ἔχοιμι τῶν μελλόντων (compare); on the preceding page (p. 609) he has a parallel sentence: τίνα τὴν ἐλπίδα (compare) ἔχοιμι. He proceeds: γινώσκεις οὖν ὅπως ἀπεκρινάμην αὐτῷ μηδὲν ἀμφιβάλλων ὡς οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν ὁνῆσει (compare Philo's ὁνῆσεις οὐδέν) τὸ φάρμακον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διπλοῦν ἐργάσεται τὸν τεταρταῖον. Compare here with the last words from the excerpt given above. It is the same joke only differently handled. On p. 609, Galen has also τῆς θεραπείας τοῦ νοσήματος; Philo has the same expression in the original place.

We shall make but one more reference. We will keep the same place in Philo, but turn to Galen's, p. 625. There he recounts his great deeds:—

προῤῥήσεις τε καὶ θεραπείας ἐποιησάμην ἀξίας ἐπαίνου μεγάλου καὶ ἐν πολλῇ δόξῃ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἦν, ὡς οἶσθα, καὶ μέγα ἦν τὸ ὄνομα Γαληνοῦ. συνηξάνετό τε τῇ δόξῃ φθόνος ἐκ τῶν οἰομένων εἶναι τι καὶ αὐτῶν, ὡς ἂν ἐν παντὶ μέρει τῆς τέχνης ὑπ' ἐμοῦ νικωμένων, ἔλεγόν τε περιθέοντες τὴν πόλιν ἄλλος ἄλλο τι διαβάλλων, ὁ μὲν ὡς κατὰ τύχην ἰασάμην τόνδε τινα ῥιψοκινδύνῳ τρόπῳ θεραπείας χρησάμενος, ὁ δ' ὡς ἐκ μαντικῆς αἰ προῤῥήσεις καὶ οὐκ ἐκ θεωρίας ἰατρικῆς γίγνονται.

Philo says that Balaam (Philo does not name him. Galen is less scrupulous) was very celebrated, and had been initiated into every form of the soothsayers' business (τὰ μαντικῆς εἰδῆ) πολλοῖς καὶ πολλαῖς ἐπιδειξάμενος ἄπιστα καὶ μεγάλα

(cf. the ἐπιδείκνυμι κ.τ.λ. from p. 656, quoted on p. 88). He was a great prophet, predicting all kinds of wonderful things—rain in summer, heat in winter, etc., καὶ θεραπείας λοιμικῶν νοσημάτων, καὶ ἄλλων μυρίων, ὧν ἕκαστον ὁ προθεσπίζειν δοκῶν ὀνομαστότατος ἦν, ἐπὶ μέγα τῆς εὐκλείας προερχόμενος διὰ τὴν ἐπιβαίνουσαν ἀεὶ καὶ φθάνουσαν πανταχόσε φήμην. Compare with Galen.

In the excerpts already referred to we find εἰς μέγα ἠύξετο ἡ διαφορά. Comp. with Philo and with the μέγα . . . συνηυξ. of Galen, who uses Philo.

Notice, further, Galen's "foolhardy method," and compare with παραβόλοις καὶ συντόμοις θεραπείαις χρώμενος from Diodorus, xvii. 31, p. 183 (quoted on p. 89, in connection with ἐναλλάξ), and the opposition here between τύχη and τέχνη, which we have ventured on p. 89 to suggest to be underlying an emphatic τέχνη, used by Galen on p. 656.

Our readers can now judge for themselves whether τύχη or τέχνη has presided over the coincidences which have been pointed out, beginning with the "striking coincidence" between Galen's mention of Sergius and S. Luke's of Saul of Tarsus, concerning each of whom ὁ καὶ Παῦλος is said. It must, however, be carefully observed that for the examination of pseudo-Galen's treatise only those pages of other than scriptural writings have been used which may be said to lie already open before us. The pages of Peregrinus, Philo, Diodorus, Cyril, the excerpts both from Helladius and Diodorus, to which references have been made, are all in our hands for other purposes. Immense weight is thus given to the coincidences which have been produced. They simply cannot have accidentally arisen. It must also be further observed that our case is now strengthened in all directions. The use of Philo and Diodorus by Clement cannot now with any show of reason be denied. It is thus not by accident, but by design, that Diodorus' xvii. 33 and Clement's *Ep.* i. 12 have so much in common, and that the one seems to be a parody of the other.

§ 5. The discovery (*vid. sup.* p. 52 sq.) that the *Bibliotheca* of Photius has been interpolated, in so far as the so-called Helladian excerpts are concerned, forces us to view the whole volume with a suspicious eye. We have seen on pp. 62, 67 some coincidences between the *Evang. Thom.* and the excerpts

from Agatharchides, contained in Phot. *Bibl.* 250. Some examination of these excerpts is now necessary.

The excerpts in question profess to be from the first and fifth books "concerning the Red Sea," by Agatharchides, a writer who is said to have flourished about 113 B.C. Strabo mentions him, and used his writings, but chiefly through Artemidorus, who is supposed to have been greatly indebted to Agatharchides. In forming an opinion upon the coincidences between Strabo and our excerpts, it is of great importance to bear in mind that Agatharchides was manipulated by Artemidorus before his statements were used by Strabo.

Diodorus also mentions Agatharchides, and is supposed to have made great use of his writings. If, indeed, our excerpts are genuine, Diodorus took the fifth book of Agatharchides as the basis of his own *lib.* iii. He brings his subjects forward nearly in the order in which they stand in the excerpts, and uses very much the same language. The close connection between our excerpts and *lib.* iii. may be accepted as an acknowledged fact.

When Strabo and Diodorus are both of them compared with the excerpts, it will be found, in a great many instances, that the accounts given in the excerpts are far more complete than those of Strabo and Diodorus separately; and that, though the language of the excerpts is for the most part nearly that of Diodorus, yet when Strabo supplies particulars not recorded by Diodorus, the language is then as nearly that of Strabo. When, moreover, as is the case sometimes, Ælian furnishes additional particulars, it will be found that the excerpts have something to correspond. The natural inference would seem to be, that the accounts given in the excerpts were compiled out of Diodorus and such other accounts as the writer could conveniently lay hands upon. That this inference is not only natural but necessary, we shall now show.

In *lib.* iii., which is supposed to be so much indebted to Agatharchides, Diodorus mentions his name three times only.

1. In c. 11, p. 181, he is merely spoken of along with Artemidorus and certain others (unnamed) as worthy of credit.

2. In c. 48, p. 216, Diodorus writes: *κατὰ δὲ τὴν δύσιν ἐναντία γίνεσθαι συμπτώματα περὶ αὐτόν. δοκεῖν γὰρ τοῖς ὁρῶσι καιναῖς ἀκτῖσι φωτίζειν τὸν κόσμον, οὐκ ἔλαττον ὥρων δεῖν ὥς*

δ' Ἀγαθαρχίδης ὁ Κνίδιος ἀνέγραψεν, ὥρων τριῶν. τοῦτον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἡδιστον τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις φαίνεσθαι κ.τ.λ. Diodorus is speaking of certain celestial phenomena, and the natural inference from his words would seem to be that he compiled his account of those phenomena from various sources, and made a special note of a certain difference of statement which he found in Agatharchides. No one would suppose that he was transferring Agatharchides bodily into his own pages, as was certainly the case if the excerpts are what they profess to be. Excerpt c. 51, p. 459, has εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐσπέραν ἐναντίον τὸ περὶ τὸν ἥλιον πάθος φασὶν ὁρᾶσθαι ὑποδείξαντα γὰρ ὅτι δέδυκε κατὰ τῆς γῆς, οὐκ ἐλάττω χρόνον ὥρων τριῶν μετὰ ταῦτα φατίζειν, ὃν καὶ νομίζουσι παρ' αὐτοῖς καιρὸν εἶναι τῆς ἡμέρας τὸν ἡδιστον. The contact here with Diodorus is made as plain as it can well be. The obvious objection is that it is too plain. We observe the words φασὶν ὁρᾶσθαι. Diodorus twice uses them earlier in this same chapter. We understand the φασὶν as he uses it. It seems to indicate that he examined more authorities than one. The δεῖν again, in the passage just quoted, is an indication of the same kind. What does the word mean in the excerpt? Does it point out that Agatharchides himself consulted various authors, and that Photius only gives a summary of his remarks, some of which dealt with opinions other than his own? Higher up in the excerpt we find φασὶν again. Are we then to suppose that Diodorus' δεῖν comes from Agatharchides? This theory, natural enough on some grounds, is quite untenable. It is simply incredible that Photius so summarizing should have accidentally produced a passage exactly parallel to that of Diodorus, except in the one word δεῖν. We are not relieved, however, from this difficulty by supposing that Photius gives us the actual words of Agatharchides. For if we examine the excerpt with Diodorus, we find not only the close correspondence in language which might be expected, but also a correspondence in the number and form of the sentences, and in the position of words in them, too close to have been brought about except by express purpose. No two writings could possibly so closely resemble one another, and yet differ so much from one another, unless these resemblances and differences had been intentionally produced.

We will now compare the excerpt with Diodorus sentence by sentence. We will not make the sentences suit our plan, but be guided by the "full stops" placed in Photius and Diodorus.

Sentence 1 in Diodorus, p. 215, begins with *ἡ δὲ κατὰ τούτους θάλαττα λευκὴ φαίνεται*; sentence 2 begins with *νῆσοι δ' εὐδαίμονες* and ends with *καὶ τοῖς θήλεσιν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐπιφύεται τὸ καθόλου κέρας*. The excerpt makes one sentence of this; it begins with *παρὰ δὲ τὴν χώραν ταύτην ἡ μὲν θάλαττα λευκὴ φαίνεται*, it places a "comma" before *νῆσοι δὲ εὐδαίμονες*, and ends with *οὐδενὶ δὲ τῶν θηλειῶν ἐπιφύεται κέρας*. Sentence 3 in Diodorus (which we may now call 2) begins with *εἰς ταύτας (νήσους)*, and sentence 2 in the excerpt with *ἐν ταύταις ταῖς νήσοις*. We shall direct special attention to this sentence directly. The next sentence in Diodorus simply closes c. 47 by saying that enough has been said upon the preceding subject, and therefore need not be taken into account. Sentence 3 then in Diodorus begins with *παρὰ δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὸν οὐρανόν*, and is less than two lines in length. The next sentence is almost as short, and has in it *θαυμασιώτατον μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ περὶ τὸν ἄρκτον*. Sentence 3, of two lines, takes up the two of Diodorus, and is *ἐστὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν θαυμασίως ἔχοντα· ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ περὶ τὸν ἄρκτον συμβαῖνον*. The next sentence in Diodorus, which we may call 4, begins with *ἀπὸ γὰρ μηνός, ὃν καλοῦσι Ἀθηναῖοι μαιμακτηριῶνα*, and in the excerpt with *ἀπὸ γὰρ μαιμακτηριῶνος, ὃς ἄγεται παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις*. Sentence 5 in Diodorus begins with *τῶν δ' ἄλλων τοὺς ὀνομαζομένους πλανήτας ἀθεωρήτους*, and in the excerpt with *τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἀστέρων οἱ μὲν πλάνητες ἀόρατοι*. Sentence 6 in Diodorus begins with *τὸν δ' ἥλιον*, in the excerpt with *τοῦ δὲ ἡλίου*. Sentence 7 in Diodorus ends with *πρὶν ὁραθῆναι τὸν ἥλιον*, and in the excerpt with *πρὶν τὸν ἥλιον ἰδεῖν*. Sentence 8 in Diodorus begins with *ἐκ μέσου δὲ τοῦ πελάγους φασὶν ἀναφαινόμενον αὐτὸν ὁρᾶσθαι μὲν ἄνθρακι* and ends with *ἐμφερῆ, μικρὸν ἐμβριθεστέραν ἔχοντι τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιφάνειαν*. The excerpt, which before combined two sentences in one, here makes three sentences out of Diodorus' one. Sentence 8 runs: *δεύτερον ὁ ἥλιος ἀναφερόμενος φαίνεται ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πελάγους*. Sentence 9 begins: *ποιεῖ δὲ τοῦτο ἄνθρακι*. Sentence 10 ends with *ἐμφερῆ, μικρὸν*

ἐμβριθέστερον ἔχοντι τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκρῶν φαντασίαν, οἷοι κεφαλὴν. Sentence 11, as we may now call it, in Diodorus begins with πρὸς δὲ τούτοις μήτ' αὐγὴν, and has in the middle πυρὸς ἀλαμποῦς ἐν σκότει· δευτέρας δ' ἀρχομένης, ἀσπιδοειδῆ, and ends with πυρῶδες καθ' ὑπερβολήν. Sentence 11 in the excerpt begins with ἔτι τοίνυν οὕτε αὐγὴν, and has in the middle ἕως πρώτης ὥρας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ σκότει πῦρ ἀλαμπές· δευτέρας δ' ἐνισταμένης . . . ἀσπιδοειδές, and ends with καὶ πυρῶδες . . . τὰς ὑπερβολάς. This brings us, both in Diodorus and the excerpt, to the passages first quoted, and these passages may be again looked at. It is quite impossible that such a persistent adherence either by Diodorus to Agatharchides, or by the compiler of the excerpts to Diodorus, could have been maintained on any honest system of writing. What is more, no small amount of skill was required to keep up the resemblances in every sentence, while still making every sentence to be different.

We have a very interesting proof at hand that Diodorus had nothing whatever to do with these resemblances and differences. More than one of these differences are noticeable, but there is one which is specially instructive.

Diodorus has: εἰς ταύτας δ' ἔμποροι πανταχόθεν καταπλέουσι, μάλιστα δ' εἰς Ποτάνας, ἣν Ἀλέξανδρος ἄκισε παρὰ τὸν Ἰνδὸν ποταμόν, ναύσταθμον ἔχειν βουλόμενος τοῦ παρὰ τὸν ὠκεανὸν παραλίου. The parallel passage in the excerpt runs: ἐν ταύταις ταῖς νήσοις ἰδεῖν ἔστιν ὁμοῦσας ἐμπορικὰς τῶν προσχώρων σχεδίας, πλείστας μὲν ἐκεῖθεν οὗ κατεστήσατο παρὰ τὸν Ἰνδὸν ποταμόν ὃ Ἀλέξανδρος ναύσταθμον, οὐκ ὀλίγας δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Περσίδος καὶ Καρμανίας καὶ τῆς σύνεγγυς πάσης. That one or other of these two sentences has been copied, and yet deliberately altered, is self-evident.

A difficulty has been felt in Diodorus' account, which Wesseling thus states: "*Potanam*, ad Indum flumen urbem, qui memoret, nemo est. *Pattala* Alexander muniit et ναυστάθμῳ καὶ νεωσοίοις instruxit: quæ nisi eadem sint ac nostri *Potanae* dicendum est, id cognominis fuisse portui sive navium stationi, cujus fundamenta idem rex non longe *Pattalis* posuit in *Arriani* vi. 20." The writer of the excerpt, who drops the name of the naval station, was equally as well aware of the difficulty which Wesseling points out as Wesseling himself,

and equally as well acquainted with the probable solution of the difficulty.

If we turn to Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* vi. 20, we find, among the words to which Wesseling refers, καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα ἐπενόει στόλον ὑπολείπεσθαι νεῶν οὐκ ὀλίγων πρὸς τῇ πόλει τοῖς Παττάλοις, ἵνα περ ἐσχίζετο ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ Ἰνδός, with ἐπὶ τὸν κόλπον τὸν Περσικόν a few lines above. Comp. the excerpt's πλείστας μὲν ἐκεῖθεν οὖ . . . οὐκ ὀλίγας δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Περσίδος. In c. 18 there is another mention of Pattala, with προσχώρων a few lines above, and with αἱ πλείσται τῶν νεῶν a few lines below. In c. 17 we find καὶ ταῦτα ἐς κόσμον καταστήσαντα (comp.) ξυμβάλλειν οἱ ἐς τὰ Πάτταλα, with ἐς Καρμανίαν only a few lines above. The way in which these coincidences have been found forbids us to believe them to be accidental. The conclusion necessarily follows that Diodorus was copied, and—since we cannot suppose that Photius, even if he had desired to forge, would have forged in this way—that the excerpts from Agatharchides, equally with those from Helladius, are merely interpolations of Photius' *Bibliotheca*. We have ample support for this conclusion.

3. In c. 18, p. 187, Diodorus says that Ptolemy III. sent a certain Simmias to explore the countries bordering on the Red Sea, and that this Simmias ἀκριβῶς, ὡς φησὶν Ἀγαθαρχίδης ὁ Κνίδιος ἱστοριογράφος, ἐξήτασε τὰ κατὰ τὴν παραλίαν ἔθνη. Diodorus proceeds: φησὶν οὖν τὸ τῶν ἀπαθῶν Αἰθιοπῶν ἔθνος κ.τ.λ. The excerpts are in close contact with Diodorus, both before and after the passage just given. It is therefore concluded that Diodorus is at this point leaning heavily upon Agatharchides. This is certainly not the necessary, perhaps not the natural, conclusion from Diodorus' own words. The writer of the article on "Simmias," in Smith's *Dict. Gr. Rom. Biogr.*, argues from them that Agatharchides derived much of his information from the authority of Simmias. Why may not Diodorus have done the very same thing? Marcianus the geographer, writing very much later, in his *Epitome* mentions a Simmias among the writers of whom he made some use. This writer may possibly be the same as the Simmias of Diodorus. It is a very singular circumstance, but a fact, that instead of the words τὰ κατὰ τὴν παραλίαν (ἔθνη) of Diodorus, quoted above as the subject of Simmias' accurate investigations, three MSS. read τὰ κατὰ

τὴν ἱστορίαν. It is difficult to suppose that this alteration could have accidentally arisen. It is natural to suppose that a deliberate alteration has been made for some purpose or other. After we have already seen, we shall probably conclude that the object was to cut away so far as might be any ground for supposing that Simmias and not Agatharchides was used.

In support of this we shall point out another singular fact. We remark among Diodorus' words φησὶν οὖν κ.τ.λ. After a few lines we have φασίν. Diodorus says: βλέποντες μὲν ἀτενῶς εἰς τὰ συντελούμενα, ταῖς δὲ κεφαλαῖς παρ' ἑκάστα διανεύοντες. διὸ καὶ φασὶν αὐτοὺς διαλέκτω μὲν μὴ χρῆσθαι, μιμητικῇ δὲ δηλώσει κ.τ.λ. Comp. βλέπουσι μὲν οὗτοι ἀτενῶς εἰς τὸ γινόμενον καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς πύκνα διανεύουσι, τῶν δὲ εἰθισμένων ἀνθρώπων πρὸς ἄνθρωπον, οὐδὲ τὴν ἐλαχίστην διδόασιν ἔννοιαν. ὅθεν (φησὶν ὁ συγγραφεύς) ἔγωγε νομίζω μηδὲ χαρακτῆρα εὐγνωστον ἔχειν αὐτούς, ἐθισμῶ δὲ καὶ νεύματι ἥχοις τε καὶ μιμητικῇ δηλώσει κ.τ.λ., *Bibl.* xv. p. 450. It thus appears that at the precise point where Diodorus introduces a φασίν, there Photius has a corresponding φησὶν ὁ συγγραφεύς, strengthened by ὅθεν ἔγωγε νομίζω. No other φησὶν or φασίν will be found in Diodorus for some pages on either side of the examples given above. Is it not strange that Photius should so pointedly seize upon this particular passage and direct special attention to it? If the writer was not Photius but an interpolator who desired to make Diodorus bear witness to the genuineness of the excerpts which he was manufacturing, could he have taken any more effectual step? Coming after what has been already observed, it is impossible with any show of reason to contend that this last coincidence is accidental. It strongly supports the conclusion to which we just now came.

We have thus examined the three places in *lib.* iii. in which Diodorus mentions the name of Agatharchides. It cannot be said that they show that Diodorus was to any great extent indebted to him. Two of them seem, on the contrary, to prove that Diodorus was himself copied. We believe the proof of this to be so conclusive that we might safely leave the question as it now stands. We would rather, however, err on the side of bringing forward too much evidence than too little. We shall therefore examine several more of the excerpts. They

are all of them easily assailable. We will not pick them, however. We shall turn first to that excerpt which supplied some coincidences for the *Evang. Thom.* (*vid. sup.* pp. 62, 67), and then take some of them in regular order.

1. We turn then once more to Strabo, p. 771, and his account of the elephant-hunters. He describes, as we have said above on p. 67, three methods of capturing the elephant which the hunters were wont to employ. The first and third of these (but not the second) are described by Diodorus, and the language of the excerpt (c. xxv.) is in close connection with that of Diodorus. The language of the excerpt, however, in describing the third, is in equally close contact with that of Strabo. The excerpt says: *τρεῖς ἄνδρες ἐν μὲν ἔχοντες τόξον, οἷστοὺς δὲ πλείους κεχρισμένους τῇ χολῇ τῶν ὄφρων, ἐστᾶσιν ἐν ὄρυμῳ παρὰ τὰς τῶν θηρίων διεξόδους· ἐπὶ οὖν προσάγει τὸ ζῶον, ὃ μὲν εἰς κατέχει τὸ τόξον τῷ ποδὶ προσβεβηκώς, οἱ δὲ δύο τὴν νευρὰν ἐλκύσαντες ἐκ τῆς ἀπάσης βιάς ἀφῆκαν τὸ βέλος κ.τ.λ.* Strabo writes: *τινὲς δὲ καὶ τοξεύμασιν ἀναιροῦσιν αὐτοὺς χολῇ βεβαμμένοις ὄφρων· ἡ δὲ τοξεία διὰ τριῶν ἀνδρῶν συντελεῖται, τῶν μὲν κατεχόντων τὸ τόξον καὶ προσβεβηκότων τοῖς ποσὶ, τοῦ δ' ἔλκοντος τὴν νευράν.* On p. 771 Strabo has *οἷστοις*.

We notice in the excerpt *προσβεβ.*, but in Strabo *προβεβ.* It happens that Diodorus writes *προσβεβηκώς ὁ τύπτων* in his description of the first method. If it is argued that Diodorus takes the word from Agatharchides, it must then be explained why he does not describe the method in which the word is found.

We remark, further, the curious difference between the two accounts, amidst so much that is the same. The story as it is told in the excerpt is exceedingly precise. Can it be that a change has been made in jest? It is just at this point, observe, where the excerpt comes into contact with the *Evang. Thom.*, *vid. sup.* pp. 67, 63. We have seen (p. 64) the interest shown by the writer of the *Evang. Thom.* in the *οὐδ' ἴσχειν τὸ ποδ' ἐναλλάξ* of Aristophanes. In the excerpt (*vid. sup.* p. 67) there is a mention of "two feet." It is a feature in the description of the third method of taking the elephant, not found either in Strabo or Diodorus. Further on in the excerpts (p. 456) *ἐναλλάξ* is used. Diodorus does not use it at that point. In the preceding page we remark *καὶ τὴν ὄψιν*

ἐμφαῖνον ἀπό τε τῶν ὀφρύων καὶ τῶν ὀμμάτων αὐστηράν. The corresponding words in Diodorus are τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφρύων πρόσοψιν αὐστηροτέραν ἔχει. Comp. οὐ φέρω τὸ αὐστηρόν τοῦ βλέμματος αὐτοῦ, *Evang. Thom.* A 7, p. 140.

If the writer of the excerpts was also the writer of the *Evang. Thom.*, or a person intimately acquainted with the secrets of the author of the gospel, the things just pointed out would be exactly what we should expect to find. We could then understand the alteration in Strabo's account of the use of the bow,—the introduction of the “two feet,”—and, further, that the mind which set two men to pull with all their might on one bow-string, might also have conceived the notion of two persons pulling with all their strength on the two ends of a piece of wood until it was stretched to the required length.

There is something more in this excerpt which has the appearance of parody. In the passage given at the beginning of this section, we may remark διεξόδους. The word is not used either by Strabo or Diodorus in the parallel accounts. It is found once in the N. T., in the parable of the “marriage supper,” recorded by S. Matthew (chap. xxii.). When all things were ready (πάντα ἔτοιμα), the parable says, and when the guests who had been invited refused to come, the servants were sent ἐπὶ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν (ver. 9) to seek others. If we turn to S. Luke xiv. 16, we find ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίησε δεῖπνον μέγα, and in ver. 17 ὅτι ἤδη ἔτοιμά ἐστι πάντα. Comp., from the third method of capturing the elephant, καὶ προκείται τοῖς θηράσασι δεῖπνον ἔτοιμον. The last two words are not found either in Strabo or Diodorus in the parallel passages. The elephant no doubt *was* δεῖπνον μέγα. The excerpt proceeds: καὶ ποιήσαντες ἕξαιμον (used in *Evang. Thom.*, *vid. sup.* p. 62) τὸ ζῶον, εἵτα νεκρόν, πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χρεῖαν ἕκαστος τὰ μέλη διαιροῦσιν. This, again, is not represented either in Strabo or Diodorus. Can this be serious writing? The author is not speaking of legs and shoulders of mutton, but of the limbs of an elephant. Comp. διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστω καθὼς βούλεται. καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστι, καὶ μέλη ἔχει πολλὰ κ.τ.λ., 1 Cor. xii. 11, and καὶ εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά . . . καὶ διεμέριζον αὐτὰ πᾶσι, καθότι ἂν τις χρεῖαν εἶχε, Acts ii. 44, 45.

2. At the close of his description of the elephant-hunters, Strabo says: τοὺς δὲ κυνηγοὺς οἱ νομάδες ἀκαθάρτους καλοῦσιν.

ὑπερκαῖται δὲ τούτων ἔθνος οὐ μέγα στρουθοφάγων, παρ' οἷς ὄρνεις κ.τ.λ., p. 772.

Excerpt c. xxvi. runs: ὅτι τῶν κυνηγῶν τούτων, οὓς οἱ νομάδες ἀκαθάρτους, καλεῖν εἰώθασι, τὸ μὲν πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἀπόσπασμα Αἰθίοπων νέμεται οὓς καλοῦσι σίμους, τὰ δὲ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν οὐ μέγα ἔθνος, οἱ καλούμενοι στρουθοφάγοι κ.τ.λ.

Diodorus says: τούτων δὲ τῶν γενῶν τὰ μὲν πρὸς ἐσπέραν μέρη κατοικοῦσιν Αἰθίοπες οἱ προσαγορευόμενοι σίμοι· τὰ δὲ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν κεκλιμένα νέμεται τὸ τῶν στρουθοφάγων γένος. ἔστι γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄρνέου τί γένος κ.τ.λ., p. 194.

The writer of the excerpt has here plainly betrayed himself. It is simply incredible that Photius, while compressing c. xxvi. of Agatharchides into eleven lines, should have accidentally gathered up so nearly exactly the words both of Strabo and Diodorus. 'Απόσπασμα is almost the only word not found in the parallel passages. It is found not far off in Strabo (p. 770), but in another sense. He applies it to a river. Of this river, excerpt c. xxii. speaks, and the language is closely connected with Strabo. 'Απόσπασμα is not used. Strabo writes, however, in v. p. 251: ἔθνος οἰκεῖ μικρὸν ἀπόσπασμα. It is natural to infer that the writer's attention was caught by Strabo's use of the word in p. 770, and that Strabo's previous use of the word in its rarer sense was remembered.

3. In excerpt c. xxvii. an account is given of the locust-eaters. They are described by Strabo on p. 772, and by Diodorus in c. 29, p. 195. Strabo calls them μελανώτεροί τε τῶν ἄλλων καὶ βραχύτεροι; Diodorus, μικρότεροι μὲν τῶν ἄλλων, ἰσχυροὶ δὲ τοῖς ὄγκοις, μέλανες δὲ καθ' ὑπερβολήν; the excerpt, βραχύτεροι μὲν τῶν λοιπῶν, ἰσχυροὶ δὲ τοῖς εἵδεσι, μέλανες δὲ ἐξαισίως. As usual, the excerpt combines Strabo and Diodorus. Clement, in *Ep.* i. 8, uses the rare comparative μελανώτερος. The passage in which it is found is very remarkable, and will be fully examined in the next section of this chapter.

The writer of the excerpt goes on to say that the locusts τῇ μὲν δυνάμει τῆς πτήσεως τῶν ὀρνίθων μικρὸν παραλλάττον, μακρὸν δὲ τῷ σώματι. ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ ζώου τρέφονται πάντα τὸν χρόνον, ἄλλως τε τούτοις καὶ τεταριχευμένοις χρώμενοι. The last part of this passage is represented in the other accounts, but the language is very different. Comp. ἰχθύων δὲ . . . τοὺς

μέν, ἐξ ἄλλης τεταριχευμένους. ὀρνίθων δὲ τοὺς τε ὄρτυγας, καὶ τὰς νήσους, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ τῶν ὀρνίθων (τὰ μικρὰ τῶν ὀρνίθων, v.l.), ὡμὰ σιτέονται, προταριχεύσαντες. Herod. ii. 77, with *λογιώτατοι μακρῶ* a few lines above. It may naturally be inferred from this that the writer of the excerpt examined or remembered Herodotus' use of *ταριχεύειν*.

The excerpt agrees with Diodorus in the description given of the extraordinary death by which the locust-eaters commonly died. They were eaten up, it seems, by winged lice, and suffered intolerable agonies. The excerpt uses the word *ἀκαρτερήτους*. A little above it has *ἀνιστορήτου*, but in another connection. Neither word is a common one, and neither of them is used by either Strabo or Diodorus in the parallel accounts. Comp., however, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν νοσήσαντες, ὡς Ἀγαθαρχίδης ἰστόρηκεν, ἄλλοις τε συμπτώμασιν ἐχρήσαντο καινοῖς καὶ ἀνιστορήτοις, καὶ δρακόντια μικρὰ τὰς κνήμας διεσθίοντα καὶ τοὺς βραχίονας ἐξέκυψεν. ἀψαμένων δ' αὖθις ἀνεύετο, καὶ φλεγμονὰς ἀκαρτερήτους ἐναιλούμενα τοῖς μυῶδεσι παρείχεν. Plut. ii. p. 733. There is no verbal connection here whatever between Plutarch and either Strabo or Diodorus, and none with the excerpt except in the two noticeable words mentioned. There ought to be in the excerpts a passage answering to this of Plutarch. It would, however, have required a special excerpt, and one by no means easy to manufacture. If this excerpt had been given, surprise would then have been felt that Diodorus should have passed it by. As, moreover, it may be argued that Plutarch is giving a scientific interpretation of the cause to which Agatharchides ascribes the death of the locust-eater, it may, perhaps, be inferred that our writer did his best to gather into the excerpt Plutarch's reference to Agatharchides by taking the words in question. At any rate, the coincidence can hardly be believed to have accidentally arisen.

4. In excerpt c. xxviii. the country adjoining to that occupied by the locust-eaters is described. We are told that it was deserted by reason of the scorpions and venomous spiders, ὧς τετραγνάθους ὀνομάζουσιν ἔνιοι, which swarmed in it. Diodorus, whose language here closely resembles that of the excerpt, omits the name of these spiders. Ælian, N. A. xvii. 40, supplies it. Compare his α καλοῦσι τετράγναθα. Strabo

(p. 772) also gives the name. Coincidences between the beginning of Ælian's c. 40 and Strabo, p. 770, seem to indicate that Ælian derived his information, in this respect, from the same source as Strabo, from Artemidorus, or perhaps from Ctesias, to whom Ælian sometimes refers, as we shall see directly.

5. Excerpt c. xxix. describes the Cynamolgi. It consists of twelve lines only, which as usual combine the information found in other accounts. The close connection with Diodorus' far longer description is acknowledged in Wesseling's notes.

The excerpt begins thus: ὅτι ὕστατοι, φησί, τῶν πρὸς μεσημβρίαν οἰκούντων εἰσὶν οὗς Ἕλληνες μὲν Κυναμολγοὺς καλοῦσιν, οἱ δ' ἀστυγείτονες, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι (note this expression), ἀγρίουσ βαρβάρους. Diodorus has τὰς δ' ἐσχατιὰς τῶν πρὸς μεσημβρίαν μερῶν κατοικοῦσιν ἄνδρες ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καλούμενοι κυνάμυνοι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν πλησιοχώρων βαρβάρων διάλεκτον ἀγριοί. Observe here the κυνάμυνοι, altered into κυναμολγοί, and the transfer of the epithet βάρβαρος to the Cynamolgi, from their neighbours. At the close of his account, Diodorus says: τὰ μὲν οὖν τελευταῖα γένη τῶν πρὸς μεσημβρίαν οἰκούντων. The excerpt, at the end, has καὶ τὰ μὲν τελευταῖα τῶν πρὸς μεσημβρίαν τοιαῦτα. This looks as if Diodorus' words had been taken, but divided, lest the excerpt should appear to be a mere slavish copy of Diodorus.

Strabo has a very brief description of the Cynamolgi. He adds, however, one particular to Diodorus' account. He calls them κατὰκομοί. The excerpt makes this point, and calls them κομήται.

Ælian, N. A. xvi. 31, gives an account of these people. All accounts, of course, agree as to the keeping of dogs. Ælian, however, says that they τρέφειν κύνας πολλούς, κατὰ τοὺς Ὑρκανοὺς τὸ μέγεθος. This last particular is neither in Diodorus nor in Strabo. The excerpt, however, has κύνας δὲ τρέφουσι πολλοὺς καὶ μεγάλους, ὁμοίως τοῖς Ὑρκανοῖς.

Strabo and Diodorus say nothing about the milking of the female dogs. Ælian, however, has καὶ τῶν θηλειῶν ἀμέλγοῦσι τὸ γάλα κ.τ.λ. The excerpt makes this point also, and says: εἶτα καὶ τὰς τῶν κυνῶν θηλείας ἀμέλγοντες τῷ γάλακτι τρέφονται. The excerpt ends where Ælian's account ends.

It happens that Ælian tells us that he was indebted to

Ctesias for his information. Schneider in a note says: "*Nisi Ælianus memoriae lapsu Ctesiam pro Agatharchide nominat, hic Ctesiam exscripsisse censendus erit. Eadem enim tradit Agatharchides apud Photium,*" etc. If, then, it was not for the existence of our excerpt, the conclusion would be that Diodorus, who uses very much the language of Ælian, was himself indebted to Ctesias. This would be probable enough, for in *lib. ii.* Diodorus expressly refers to Ctesias at least seven times. And in *lib. iii. 11*, p. 181, he mentions Agatharchides, Artemidorus, καὶ τινες ἕτεροι, as reliable authorities on the subjects which he had in hand. The notion that Diodorus made use of Ctesias receives some little confirmation from the circumstance that Diodorus has τοὺς κύνας ἐπαφιάσι, and Ælian an answering τοὺς τροφίμους αὐτῶν κύνας ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀφιάσιν. There is no coincidence with the excerpt in this particular.

If, however, we hold the excerpts to be genuine, we must then believe that Agatharchides and Ælian copied Ctesias, that Strabo copied Artemidorus, that Artemidorus and Diodorus copied Agatharchides, and that Photius, in making his brief summary of the last-named writer's account of the Cynamolgi, accidentally managed to give those particulars, and no others, which must now be gathered from Strabo, Diodorus, and Ælian. Can this be believed? If, for convenience' sake, we suppose Ælian's memory to have failed him, and that he wrote Ctesias in mistake instead of Agatharchides, the demand on our faith will be hardly less.

6. We have produced, we believe, evidence amply sufficient to expose the real character of these so-called excerpts from Agatharchides. We have, however, not yet redeemed the promise given on p. 68, to show the source whence the τῆς καμάρας there referred to is taken.

We turn, therefore, to the excerpt (next in order), c. xxx. It gives an account of the Troglodytes. For the sake of showing that this excerpt is marked by the same features as the preceding five, we shall quote a few lines of it for examination.

The writer says: ἐπὰν δὲ ἐπιστῇ τὸ θέρος, ἐν τοῖς τελματάδεσιν ἀναστρέφονται χωρίοις, μαχόμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τοῦ χιλώματος. Καὶ τὰ πρεσβύτερα τῶν βοσκημάτων καὶ νοσοῦντα δαπανῶσι, διὰ τῶν μαγείρων ταῦτα κτείνοντες, οὓς καλοῦσιν

ἀκαθάρτους. This is, as usual, in close connection with Diodorus, c. 32, p. 197. The words διὰ τῶν μαγ. to the end are, however, unrepresented. Strabo supplies them : καὶ ἄλλως πολλαχῶς σκευαζομένων ὑπὸ τῶν μαγείρων οὓς καλοῦσιν ἀκαθάρτους. The remainder of the sentence in the excerpt is nearly in the words of Diodorus, but is unrepresented in Strabo.

The word χίλωμα is hardly found. The scholiast on Hom. *Od.* xi. 134, indeed, quotes as from Æschylus ἐρῶδιος γὰρ ὑψόθεν ποτάμενος, ὃν θ' ὥς ἐπληξεν ἡ δ' υἱὸς χειλώμασιν, ἐκ τοῦδε ἄκανθα ποντίου βοσκήματος κ.τ.λ. Compare. The passage is, however, corrupt. Compare, further, Hesychius : χιλός, ἡ τροφή, καὶ χιλὸν τὸ αὐτὸ (εἰς ταὐτὸ μίξαντες is said in the excerpt three lines above χιλώμασιν. It is not in Strabo, but is an alteration of Diodorus' μίσγοντες ταῦτα) καὶ χόρτος τῶν βοσκημάτων (compare), and directly χιλοῦσθαι. That the history of the use of the word χίλωμα in the excerpt is something of this kind, would seem plain by referring for χιλοῦσθαι to Xen. *Anab.* vii. 2. 21, where ἐχίλου is found, and in its neighbourhood some coincidences with another part of the excerpt now in hand.

The word τελματώδης is not a common word. The excerpt uses it in the passage quoted above, but it is not in the parallel passages either in Strabo or Diodorus. Strabo uses it in *lib.* xvii. p. 793, but in an entirely different connection : ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρῃ δὲ τοῦ θέρους (obs.) ἀρχομένου πληρούμενος ὁ Νεῖλος πληροῖ καὶ τὴν λίμνην καὶ οὐδὲν ἑᾶ τελματώδες τὸ τὴν ἀναφορὰν ποιῆσον μοχθηράν. Compare with the excerpt (quoted p. 104). Eight lines below, in the excerpt, μοχθηρῶ is found ; but it is not either in Strabo or Diodorus in the parallel passages.

Immediately after the passage just quoted from Strabo, p. 793, the royal burial-places at Alexandria are described. Among other things, Strabo says : τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου κομίσας ὁ Πτολεμαῖος ἐκῆδυσεν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ κ.τ.λ. "Locus erat urbe media, regum sepulturæ destinatus, quem Σῆμα vocabant." These words, though they are very nearly an exact translation of some of Strabo's here, are taken from Wesseling's note to Diod. xviii. 28, p. 279, where Diodorus says that Ptolemy κατεσκεύασεν οὖν τέμενος κατὰ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ κατὰ τὴν κατασκευὴν τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου δόξης ἄξιον, ἐν ᾧ κηδεύσας αὐτόν κ.τ.λ.

Now, just above this Diodorus gives that description of the chariot in which the body of Alexander was carried, to which we referred on p. 68, in connection with the *Evang. Thom.* As we have already pointed out, *καμάρα* is there used a great number of times. This word, however, is here in the excerpt a few lines only below *τελματώδης*, which forms a connecting link with Strabo, at that point where Strabo and Diodorus meet in their accounts of the burial of Alexander. After the use of the word *καμάρα*, the excerpt goes on to speak of the funeral rites of the Troglodytes. The word *κηδείαις* is used. It is not in Strabo or Diodorus in the parallel passages. Compare, however, the *κηδεύειν* of both Strabo and Diodorus just pointed out.

The use of the word *καμάρα* here in the excerpt is, as we have pointed out on p. 68, very remarkable. The writer breaks the thread of his narrative to say: *ὅτι κέχρηται ὁ συγγραφεύς, ἀπτικιστῆς καίτοι ὢν, τῇ τῆς καμάρας λέξει.* We remarked just now (p. 98) the pointed way (*ὅθεν [φησὶν ὁ συγγραφεύς] ἔγωγε νομίζω κ.τ.λ.*) in which the writer¹ makes his own certain statements of Diodorus in c. 18, p. 187. On that same page Diodorus goes on to speak of the various refuges from the heat of the sun which the fish-eaters either found or contrived. It happens that, in describing such of these as were made out of the ribs of large fish, he says: *σκεπαζομένης οὖν τῆς καμάρας, ἐν ταύτῃ τὸ βαρύτατον τοῦ καύματος ἀναπαύονται.* Here, then, in this place, very specially marked out as in close contact with our excerpts, in a passage the language of which is very much that of excerpt c. xvii., is the exact expression *τῆς καμάρας* to which the writer of c. xxx. calls attention in such a strange fashion. If the excerpts were genuine, it would be a fair conclusion that the

¹ With the words *διὸ καὶ φασὶν αὐτοὺς διαλίκτω μὲν μὴ χρῆσθαι*, thus specially laid hold of by the writer of the excerpt, compare *Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ οὔτε γῇ οὔτε φωνῇ οὔτε ἔθει διακεκριμένοι πᾶν λοιπῶν εἰσιν ἀνθρώπων. οὔτε γὰρ σου πόλεις ἰδίας κατοικοῦσιν, οὔτε διαλίκτω τινὶ παρηλλαγμῇ χρῶνται*, *Diognet.* v. 1. In iii. 8, p. 179, Diodorus has *παρηλλαγμῆν οἱ δ' ἔθει χρῶνται*. Compare with *Diognetus*. If *Diognetus* had been written either by the compiler of the excerpts, or by one intimately acquainted with his secrets and following in his footsteps, the coincidences which we have just pointed out would be of the very kind which we should expect to find.

τῆς καμάρας of Diodorus, though not found in Photius' summary, was taken from Agatharchides.

Strabo, p. 773, has a few words upon the fish-eaters: οἰκοῦσι δ' ἐν σπηλαίοις ἢ μάνδραις στεγασταῖς ἀπὸ δοκῶν μὲν καὶ στρωτῆρων τῶν κητείων ὀστέων καὶ ἀκανθῶν, φυλλάδος δ' ἐλαϊνης. There are two points here worthy of notice. Diodorus has ἐλάται φύονται κ.τ.λ.; Wesseling desires to read ἐλαῖαι; the writer of the excerpt has the same desire, and writes ἐλαιῶν. Diodorus does not use the word μάνδρα. The writer of the excerpts does not use it here; but, observe, he *does* use it in c. xxx., only a few lines after τῆς καμάρας. He says: ἐπ' αὐτῷ δὲ νῦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, εἰς μάνδρας μὲν συνάγουσι τὴν λείαν, ἀνωθεν δὲ ἐπιβάλλουσι ῥιπούς ἐκ φοινίκων. Comp. Strabo's μάνδραις στεγασταῖς. The writer uses ἐπιβάλλειν in describing the dwellings of the fish-eaters in the very sentence in which, in Diodorus, τῆς καμάρας is found, and in which, in Strabo, μάνδραις is found.

The passage in c. xxx., from which we have just given some words, has nothing answering to it in Diodorus; the language, however, is nearly that of Strabo (p. 776), who supplies Diodorus' deficiency. The particular words, however, given above, have nothing corresponding to them in Strabo. They belong to the writer of the excerpt, who plainly takes the idea from Strabo's μάνδραις στεγασταῖς.

It is evident, then, that the τῆς καμάρας of c. xxx. is taken from Diodorus. It is not at all evident what the writer's object was in marking out the word as he has done. It may, with the translator of the excerpts, mean "a town in Crete;" or with Arrian, "a bed"—and the coincidences with the *Evang. Thom.*, with which καμάρα is concerned (*vid. sup.* pp. 67, 68), have to do with the miraculous story of the bedstead; or it may have other meanings and other connections.

It is quite possible that there may have been some local controversy, or some jest connected with the word in the writer's day, which gave it a special interest in his mind. In *Homilies* of a certain class, ὁ στήσας ὡς καμάραν τὸν οὐρανόν Isa. xl. 22 is a very favourite expression. Patient inquiry will doubtless clear up the mystery.

§ 6. The question whether μελανώτερος (*vid. sup.* p. 101) was honestly used by the writer of Clement's epistle, as the word which occurred naturally to his mind, or was selected by him

for its rarity, can only be answered by a careful examination of the passage in which it is found. If this passage should turn out to be nothing but a skilful compilation from a variety of sources, it may fairly be inferred that the writer deliberately selected *μελανώτερος* for special reasons. Its use will then form a connecting link between Clement's epistle and the forged excerpts from Agatharchides, which have been shown to be indebted to the very passage of Strabo which contains the word. The *Evangelium Thomæ* professes to be an ancient apocryphal gospel. It certainly is not the *Evang. Thom.* known to the ancients. We may therefore properly conclude that an interest was felt in some quarters in apocryphal literature. A curious connection between this spurious apocryphal gospel and Clement's epistle has been observed. It will be well, therefore, to pay particular attention to the passage in which *μελανώτερος* is found, for this passage professes to be an apocryphal quotation, taken, as is supposed, from an apocryphal or interpolated book of Ezekiel.

We shall give *Ep. i. 8* (which contains the quotation) entire; but in order that we may have more of Clement's own Greek before us, we shall precede it by the greater part of § 7.

§ 7. . . . διὸ . . . καὶ ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα, καὶ ἴδωμεν τί καλὸν καὶ τί τερπνὸν καὶ τί προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς· ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν ὡς ἔστι τίμιον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθέν, παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ἐπήνεγκε· διέλθωμεν τὰς γενεὰς πάσας καὶ καταμάθωμεν ὅτι ἐν γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν. Νῦν ἐκῆρυξε μετανοίαν, καὶ οἱ ὑπακούσαντες ἐσωθήσαν· Ἰωνᾶς Νινευίταις καταστροφὴν ἐκῆρυξεν, οἱ δὲ μετανοήσαντες ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν αὐτῶν ἐξιλιάσαντο τὸν Θεὸν ἱκετεύοντες καὶ ἔλαβον σωτηρίαν καίπερ ἀλλότριοι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄντες. § 8. οἱ λειτουργοὶ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου περὶ μετανοίας ἐλάλησαν, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων περὶ μετανοίας ἐλάλησεν μεθ' ὅρκου—

“Ὡς γὰρ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος, οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ὡς τὴν μετάνοιαν.”

προστιθεὶς καὶ γνῶμην ἀγαθὴν·

“Μετανοήσατε, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας ὑμῶν· εἶπον τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ μου. Ἐὰν ὥσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐὰν ὥσιν πυρρῶτεραι κόκκου καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκου, καὶ ἐπιστραφῇτε πρὸς με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπητε, Πάτερ, ἐπακούσομαι ὑμῶν ὡς λαοῦ ἁγίου.”

Καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ (Isa. ii. 16–20), λέγει οὕτως:—

“Λούσασθε καὶ (om. CS with LXX.), καθαροὶ γένεσθε, ἀφέλεσθε (ἀφέλετε C with LXX.) τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου· παύσασθε ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν, μάθετε κáλoν ποιεῖν, ἐκζητήσατε κρίσιν, ῥύσασθε ἀδικούμενον, κρίνατε ὀρφανῷ καὶ δικαιώσατε χήρᾱ (A; χήραν C with LXX.)· καὶ δεῦτε καὶ (om. S with LXX.)· . . . ἐλεγχθώμεν (A; διαλεχθῶμεν C; *loquamur cum alterutro*. S Light. p. 412; διελεγχθῶμεν LXX.), λέγει (A; κύριος ins. CS with LXX.)· καὶ ἐὰν ᾧσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ· ἐὰν δὲ ᾧσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς ἔριον λευκανῶ· καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε καὶ εἰσακούσητέ μου, τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς φάγεσθε· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε μηδὲ εἰσακούσητέ μου, μάχαιρα ὑμῶς κατέδεσται· τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα.”

Πάντας οὖν τοὺς ἀγαπητοὺς αὐτοῦ βουλόμενος μετανοίας μετασχεῖν, ἐστήριξε τῷ παντοκρατορικῷ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ.

Clement's divergences from Isa. i. 16–20 are all pointed out above, and it is evident that he had the LXX. before him.

The apocryphal quotations given above are not found either in whole or in part in any apocryphal writing now in existence, nor are they, either in whole or in part, anywhere attributed to an apocryphal writing. Have they been honestly taken from some lost document, or have they been manufactured for the occasion? This is the question for solution.

1. In order that Clement's method of composition may be thoroughly understood, we shall somewhat carefully examine his use of the LXX. and New Testament in those portions of §§ 7, 8, which are manifestly his own. We shall then consider what indications may be found in them of a similar use of writings other than scriptural.

(1.) In illustration of the opening sentences, Lightfoot quotes LXX. Ps. cxxxii. 1 ἰδοὺ (obs.) δὴ τί καλὸν ἢ τί τερπνόν κ.τ.λ.; 1 Tim. ii. 3 τοῦτο καλὸν καὶ ἀποδεκτον ἐνώπιον (obs.) τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ (“of which Clement's language here seems to be a reminiscence,” Light.); 1 Pet. i. 19 τιμὴ αἵματι ὡς ἁμνοῦ ἁμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ. He also refers to Wisd. ix. 12. Turning to Wisdom, we find in ver. 1 ὁ ποιήσας (obs.) τὰ πάντα; in ver. 10 καὶ γινῶ (obs.) τί εὐάρεστόν ἐστι παρὰ σοί· οἶδε γὰρ κ.τ.λ.; in ver 12 καὶ ἔσται προσδεκτὰ (obs.) τὰ ἔργα μου. Observe here the form which Clement's second sentence finally assumes after the manipulation of some of the texts just given.

Clement's τίμιον κ.τ.λ. reminds us of LXX. Ps. cxv. 15 τίμιος ἐναντίον κυρίου ὁ θάνατος ὁσίων αὐτοῦ. Now mark the connection between this verse and Wisd. ix. 5, which has the words ἐγὼ δοῦλος σὸς καὶ υἱὸς τῆς παιδείας σου, in common with the 16th verse of the Psalm.

In § 21 Clement has τὰ καλὰ καὶ εὐάρεστα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιῶμεν μεθ' ὁμονοίας, followed after two lines by οὐδὲν ἔληθεν αὐτὸν τῶν ἐννοιῶν ἡμῶν οὐδὲ τῶν διαλογισμῶν ὧν ποιούμεθα. Compare with the foregoing, and add Wisd. ix. 14 λογισμοὶ γὰρ . . . αἱ ἐπίνοιαι ἡμῶν; x. 8 τοῦ μὴ γινῶναι τὰ καλὰ . . . μηδὲ λαθεῖν. The preceding verses are used in § 11.

In illustration of the first sentence of § 7, given above, Lightfoot (p. 410) refers to § 19. These two sections have a good deal in common. Compare Clement's ἀτενίσωμεν (obs.) εἰς τὸν πατέρα καὶ κτιστὴν τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου with the πατέρα κόσμου μόνον κτισθέντα of Wisd. x. 1.

In § 61 Clement has σύ, δέσποτα, ἔδωκας . . . οἷς δός . . . εἰς τὸ διέπειν αὐτοὺς τὴν ὑπὸ σοῦ δεδομένην αὐτοῖς ἡγεμονίαν ἀπροσκόπως (vid. sup. p. 24) . . . τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὑπαρχόντων. σύ, Κύριε, διέβυθον τὴν βουλὴν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ καλὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιόν σου, ὅπως διέποντες ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ πραύτητι κ.τ.λ. Compare with the foregoing, and add Wisd. ix. 2 "And ordained man through Thy wisdom, that he should have dominion over the creatures which Thou hast made;" ver. 3 καὶ διέπη τὸν κόσμον ἐν οσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ ἐν εὐθύτητι ψυχῆς κρίσιν κρίνῃ. δός μοι κ.τ.λ.; ver. 6 ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων; ver. 17 βουλὴν δέ σου . . . σὺ ἔδωκας κ.τ.λ.; ver. 19 καὶ οὕτως διορθώθησαν (διορθωσάμεθα § 21) αἱ τρίβοι τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κ.τ.λ.

Διέπειν is also used in Wisd. xii. 15: δίκαιος δὲ ἂν δικαίως τὰ πάντα διέπεις κ.τ.λ., and not elsewhere, either in the LXX. or N. T. In ver. 17 we find ἰσχὺν γὰρ ἐνεδείκνυσαι; in ver. 18 ἐν ἐπιεικείᾳ κρίνεις. Compare Clement's ἐν πραύτητι. In § 21 he has ἐνδειξάσθωσαν, τὸ ἀκέραιον τῆς πραύτητος αὐτῶν βούλημα (cf. his τὴν βουλὴν αὐτῶν above) ἀποδειξάτωσαν, τὸ ἐπιεικές κ.τ.λ. We shall show presently the ἐν ἐπιεικείᾳ of Wisdom to be used in Diognet. vii. (ἀλλ' ἐπιεικείᾳ, πραύτητι) to which it is connected through ver. 14 οὔτε βασιλεὺς ἢ τύραννος ἀντοφθαλμησάι δυνήσεταιί σοι κ.τ.λ.; cf. τοῦ ἔργου αὐτοῦ ὁ νωθρὸς καὶ παρειμένος (καὶ νωθρὸς καὶ παρειμένος ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις

σου, Eccclus. iv. 29), οὐκ ἀντοφθαλμειῖ τῷ ἔργοπαρέκτῃ αὐτοῦ, § 34.

We referred just now to ver. 18. It ends with *πάρεστι γάρ σοι ὅταν θέλῃς τὸ δύνασθαι*. Ver. 11 has *οὐδὲ εὐλαβούμενός τινα κ.τ.λ.*; ver. 12 *τίς γὰρ ἔρεῖ, τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου*. In ver. 17 is *ἰσχύει*, as we have already seen. This word is also in vv. 16, 18. In xi. 21 is *τὸ γὰρ μεγάλως ἰσχύειν πάρεστι σοι πάντοτε, καὶ κράτει βραχίονός σου τίς ἀντιστήσεται*; and in ver. 22 *ὅλος ὁ κόσμος ἐναντίον σου*. Compare these passages together. In § 27 Clement says:—

ἀναζωπυρησάτω οὖν ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ νοήσωμεν ὅτι πάντα ἐγγὺς αὐτῷ ἔστιν. ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύνανται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι. Τίς ἔρεῖ αὐτῷ Τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ; ὅτε θέλει καὶ ὡς θέλει ποιήσει πάντα, καὶ οὐδὲν μὴ παρέλθῃ τῶν δεδογματισμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Πάντα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ εἰσι, καὶ οὐδὲν λέληθε τὴν βουλήν αὐτοῦ, εἰ οὐρανοὶ κ.τ.λ. LXX. Ps. xviii. 1–3.

Clement here, then, quotes Wisd. xii. 12, but alters it so as to combine xi. 21. This is plain from the *ὅταν θέλῃς* of xi. 18, and the *ὅλος ὁ κόσμος ἐναντίον σου* of xii. 22. With the opening words of the passage just given, comp. Wisd. ix. 1 (already used): *ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου*. Clement's *καταστρέψαι* carries us back to §§ 7, 8, for the closing words of § 6 are *ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις πόλεις μεγάλως κατέστρεψεν καὶ ἔθνη μεγάλα ἐξερίζωσεν*. Comp. Eccclus. xxviii. 11, *ἔρις κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 14: *γλῶσσα (obs.) . . . καὶ πόλεις ὀχυράς καθεῖλε, καὶ οἰκίας μεγιστάνων κατέστρεψε*. (The whole passage is imitated in § 55.) Cod. C. supplies an interesting and instructive reading. It substitutes *κατέσκαψε* for *κατέστρεψεν*. Comp. Jer. i. 10: *ἰδοὺ καθέστακά σε σήμερον ἐπὶ ἔθνη καὶ ἐπὶ βασιλείας, ἐκρίζοῦν καὶ κατασκάπτειν*.

Clement's next sentence contains the words *νουθετοῦντες, ὑπομιμνήσκοντες*. They carry us back to Wisd. xii. 2, where we observe *ὑπομιμνήσκων νουθετεῖς*. In ver. 10, comp. *ἐδίδους τρόπον μετανόιας*, and in ver. 19 *ὅτι διδως ἐπὶ ἁμαρτήμασι μετάνοιαν*, with the latter part of § 7, quoted above.

In the passage from § 27, Clement appears to use LXX. Ps. cxlviii. 5, 6: *ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε καὶ ἐγενήθησαν, αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν ἔστησεν αὐτὰ . . . πρόσταγμα ἔθετο, καὶ οὐ παρελεύσεται*.

It is not the simple fact that Clement uses the sacred writings to which we call attention—this no one will deny—but to the peculiar way in which he uses them. He often expressly cites them, but far oftener uses them without citation. He manufactures his sentences out of them. He combines two or three (perhaps parallel) texts in one short sentence of his own. He alters a text apparently for no other reason than to combine another text with it. He uses the LXX. as a schoolboy might use Xenophon's *Anabasis*, not slavishly copying it, but leaning upon it for words and combinations of words. Proof of this may be multiplied to any extent. In § 60, Clement has ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἐν τοῖς ὀρωμένοις καὶ πιστὸς ἐν τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπὶ σε, ἐλεῆμον καὶ οἰκτίρμον, ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ τὰς ἀδικίας καὶ τὰ παραπτώματα καὶ πλημμελίαν. Several commentators have found a difficulty in Clement's ὀρωμένοις, and have made conjectural alterations; but, as Lightfoot truly says, "The idea, and in part the language, is taken from Wisd. xiii. 1, ἐκ τῶν ὀρωμένων ἀγαθῶν οὐκ ἴσχυσαν εἰδέναι τὸν ὄντα οὔτε τοῖς ἔργοις προσχόντες ἐπέγνωσαν τὸν τεχνίτην. The language in the latter part of the sentence is suggested by Eccclus. ii. 10 sq. τίς ἐνεπίστευσε Κυρίῳ καὶ κατησχύνθη; . . . διότι οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεῆμων ὁ Κύριος, καὶ ἀφίησιν ἀμαρτίαν." Observe, here, the changed use of ἀγαθός, the alteration of ἐνεπίστευσε Κυρίῳ into τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπὶ σε, and the expansion of ἀμαρτίαν. Clement's sentence is a plain manufacture. Eccclus. ii. 10 begins with ἐμβλέψατε εἰς ἀρχαίας γενεάς καὶ ἴδετε, τίς ἐνεπιστ. κ.τ.λ. Comp. Clement's διέλθωμεν τὰς γενεάς πάσας κ.τ.λ. of § 7, quoted p. 108. Here is the idea of Ecclesiasticus. The combination of verbs is found in a parallel section: ἴδωμεν αὐτὸν κατὰ διάνοιαν καὶ ἐμβλέψωμεν κ.τ.λ., § 19. In § 60, a few lines above the passage just quoted, Clement has ὁ πιστὸς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς (here is the idea again), looking, as Lightfoot shows, at Deut. vii. 9 Θεὸς πιστὸς ὁ φυλάσσων διαθήκην . . . εἰς χιλιάς γενεάς.

It is evident that Clement did not write "currente calamo," but had a reason for every word which he placed in his sentences. There was, moreover, a place from which almost every word was deliberately taken. Words had other words associated with them in his mind, and when one was used,

the others followed at no great distance. The way in which Clement used the LXX. and N. T. point out unmistakeably a certain habit or method of writing. With such a habit he must have used writings not scriptural in the same fashion. We have already seen indications of this in the word *ἑλλόγιμος* (*vid. sup.* p. 27), as used by Plato and Philo; in *προστάτης* (*vid. sup.* p. 22), as used by Sophocles; in *ἐναλλάξ* (*vid. sup.* pp. 23, 73 sq.), as used by Diodorus.

(2.) We shall now bring Clement's own Greek in §§ 7, 8, 27, as quoted above, into comparison with some ecclesiastical and secular writings. If we find indications of the use of those writings precisely similar in character to the indications of the use of the sacred writings already observed, we cannot, if we are to act impartially, turn round and dismiss these as mere "accidental coincidences."

(A.) We shall turn our attention, in the first instance, to that portion of § 27 which is quoted on p. 111.

(α) Observe the opening words, *ἀναζωπυρησάτω κ.τ.λ.*

Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* i. 1, p. 324, has *ταῦτα δὲ ἀναζωπυρῶν ὑπομνήμασι*, and presently *τὰ δογματιζόμενα*. Comp. with § 27. After two lines he has *κατὰ τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως κανόνα*, p. 325 (quoted by Lightfoot, p. 410, who concludes that the "phrase" was "borrowed" from our Clement). If, however, the writer of Clement's epistle was the "borrower," he would almost necessarily bethink himself of *τῆς πίστεως ἀναζωπύρησιν*, Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23, p. 144. Comp. with § 27. We say "almost necessarily," for Eusebius in this chapter informs us, on the authority of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, that Clement's epistle was read in the churches from the earliest times. A late writer, seeking to palm off his own writing as that of Clement of Rome, would, as a matter of course, have paid special attention to this chapter. Eusebius gives a portion of one of Dionysius' letters, which is of some interest. Dionysius says: *ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὑμῖν ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῦτο, πάντας μὲν ἀδελφούς ποικίλως εὐεργετεῖν, Ἐκκλησίαις τε πολλαῖς ταῖς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐφόδια πέμπειν, ὧδε μὲν τῶν δεομένων πενίαν ἀναψύχοντας, ἐν μετέλλοις δὲ ἀδελφοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἐπιχορηγοῦντας. . . ἔθος . . . ὁ οὐ μόνον διατετήρηκεν ὁ μακάριος ὑμῶν ἐπίσκοπος Σωτὴρ κ.τ.λ.* Comp. *ἑξήκει* (Proteus) *οὗν τοδεύτερον πλανησόμενος, ἱκανὰ ἐφόδια τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς*

ἔχων. *Peregrin.* 16; also (with both) τοῖς ἐφοδίοις τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀρκοῦμενοι. *Clem. Ep.* i. 2. Having observed these things, and knowing our writer's delight in a jest, we thought that ἐπίσκοπος Σωτήρ would hardly escape. Knowing ἐπίσκοπος to be used in a rather peculiar way in § 59, we turned with some interest to that section. We found τὸν τῶν ἀπηλπισμένων σωτήρα, τὸν παντὸς πνεύματος κτίστην καὶ ἐπίσκοπον. There may be joke within joke here, for Lightfoot remarks: "In Amos iv. 13 we have ἐγὼ . . . κτίζων πνεῦμα, where it apparently means 'the wind,' but might easily be understood otherwise." Curiously enough, we have the joke, if it be a joke, exactly reversed in *Ep.* i. 20. There Clement has ἀνέμων σταθμοὶ κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον καιρὸν τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν ἀπροσκόπως ἐπιτελοῦσιν. *Comp.* οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα κ.τ.λ. *Heb.* i. 14. The use of *Heb.* i., ii. in § 20 may be easily shown (*vid. sup.* p. 24). Curiously, again, the expression ἀνέμων σταθμοί from *Job* xxviii. 25 has been so altered in "meaning," that Lightfoot is obliged to suppose that Clement has "misunderstood" it. "Accident" has dealt very hardly with Clement's language if all these things are accidental.

If we turn to § 59 we find (very soon after ἐπίσκοπον) τοῖς δεομένοις . . . τοὺς πλανωμένους (*cf.* the πλανησόμενος of *Peregrin.* 16 given just above) . . . λύτρωσαι τοὺς δεσμίους ἡμῶν. *Comp.* with *Dionysius* above. The coincidences with the liturgies in this part of Clement are undeniable. We see here whence some hints for their use might have been derived. It must be remembered that ἐπίσκοπος Σωτήρ guided us to § 59.

(β) There are some words in § 27 which seem to be the property of Hippolytus, who has πάντα ποιῶν ὡς θέλει, καθὼς θέλει, ὅτε θέλει. *Contr. Noet.* viii. p. 815; *comp.* with § 27, *sup.* p. 111. A few lines below, on the same page, Hippolytus has θεοσέβειαν ἀσκεῖν. In *Ep.* ii. 20 Clement has ἐμπορίαν ἡσκοῦμεν καὶ οὐ θεοσέβειαν. *Comp.* παρέχειν μωρίαν εἰκὸς μᾶλλον ἡγοῦντ' αὖν, οὐ θεοσέβειαν. *Diognet.* iii. 3. To this passage from *Diognetus* another may be added:—

οἷς ὅρια πίστεως οὐ θραύεται οὐδὲ ὅρια πατέρων παρορίζεται· εἴτα φόβος νόμου ἄδεται, καὶ προφητῶν χάρις γινώσκεται, καὶ εὐαγγελίων πίσις ἰδρυται, καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσις φυλάσσεται, καὶ ἐκκλησίας χάρις σκιρτᾷ· ἢν χάριν μὴ λυπῶν ἐπιγνώσῃ ἃ λόγος ὁμιλεῖ, δι' ὧν βούλεται,

ὅτε θέλει (obs.). ὅσα γὰρ θελήματι τοῦ κελεύοντος λόγου ἐκινήθημεν ἐξείπειν μετὰ πόνου. *Diognet.* xi. 5 sq. ἀσκουμένην γνῶσιν. xii. 5.

The elaborate expression, τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κελεύοντος λόγου, is noteworthy. In chap. vii. we shall have occasion to point out a number of coincidences between *Diognetus* and *Contr. Noet.*, which will show that these writings are not independent of one another. Still Hippolytus' constant expressions, both in *Contr. Noet.* and the *Refutatio*, are τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρός, and ὁ κελεύων Πατήρ. In chap. vii. we shall give reasons for believing that the changes have been made in *Diognetus* for the express purpose of showing that cc. xi., xii. do *not* belong to the times of Hippolytus. This question does not concern us at the present moment. We mention it now, however, because we think that a second intentionally made theological note of time may be pointed out in the words just quoted from *Diognet.* xi., and one which will help to illustrate those portions of Clement's *Ep.* i. which are now in hand.

The strange expression in *Diognet.* xi. (*vid. sup.*), ἐκκλησίας χάρις σκιρτᾷ, has naturally attracted some attention. Bunsen desired to alter χάρις into χαρά. It happens that in § 7 (*vid. sup.* p. 108) there is an expression partly parallel, and one which has attracted even more attention—μετανοίας χάριν. Observe the τὸν τῆς παραδόσεως κανόνα of § 7, and its simplicity in the writer's view, and compare with the more elaborate ὅρια πίστεως, ὅρια πατέρων, ἀποστόλων παράδοσις of *Diognet.* xi. Observe, also, the οἱ λειτουργοὶ (“i.e. the prophets.” Light-foot) τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ of § 8, and the alteration into προφητῶν χάρις in *Diognetus*. In § 27 observe the very ecclesiastical δεδογματισμένων, but which is used of the decrees of GOD; and notice the connection, such as it is, between § 27 and *Diognet.* xi. We venture to think that, while in Clement we are supposed to have the simplicity of primitive Christian faith,—just as in the earlier part of *Diognetus* (c. v.) we are supposed to have the simplicity of primitive Christian life,—the ἐκκλησίας χάρις of *Diognet.* xi. is intended to mark, in the writer's mind, a later theological development with which he had no sympathy. Certainly the expression, “the grace of the church skips,” seems to savour of jest or satire.

The very form of the sentence in which the expression stands seems to mark it out as satire: οὐ θραύεται, οὐδὲ παρορί-

ζέται, ἄδεται, γινώσκειται, ἴδρυται, φυλάσσεται, . . . σκιρτᾷ. It is sheer nonsense if it is not satire. If, however, the transfer of χάρις from μετανοίας to ἐκκλησίας was actually made, if, that is, the expression, "the grace of the church skips," is simple satire, it is significant enough. The writer may or may not have had faith in "the grace of repentance;" he certainly had none in "the grace of the church," and nothing but contempt for those "later theological developments," to which the expression "grace of the church" may be thought to point. It leads us to expect that we shall somewhere find a treatise in which such "later developments" are the subjects of his ridicule; in which the tenets which he specially abhorred are satirized by the extravagance with which they are advocated; in which the wit consists in adapting language originally applied to the highest and holiest of things, to things less high and holy, and perhaps even ridiculous. This treatise, if we are right in our conjectures as to the history of ἐκκλησίας χάρις σκιρτᾷ, will be found to be in close connection with Clement's epistles or *Diognetus* (or both), and to be indebted to those sources to which the writer (or writers) of those documents appears to have applied himself.

(γ) Such a treatise we can produce, one in which, from end to end, the words of Holy Scripture are ceaselessly played upon, in which men are spoken of with those combinations of epithets which specially belong to God in the LXX.; in which the solemn pleadings of the liturgies with the Almighty are addressed to an earthly monarch; in which the sitting of Jesus by Jacob's well is the subject of parody; in which the "cultus" of images is advocated with inconceivable absurdity, while in those images χάρις is made in the most pointed way to reside.

This treatise professes to be a letter addressed to the Emperor Theophilus, the Iconoclast. It is found amongst the writings of John of Damascus. It cannot be his, and has been supposed to be a "synodical" letter, written by Christopher, patriarch of Alexandria, and to have been signed by 1455 bishops and priests. It is, however, in character such as we have described, as the briefest inspection will show. That it should contain "later developments," and that these should be stated with some extravagance of language, is of course to be expected. The question is, whether this extravagance of state-

ment is the natural language of an earnest and conscientious advocate of image-worship, or the artificial and assumed extravagance and parody of some later satirist.

Whether we are right or wrong in regarding the *Epistola ad Theophilum* as a satire, it most certainly contains a great number of coincidences with Clement.

In *Theoph.* xxxi. (the last §) the following passage is found :

ταῦτα ὀρίζομεν τῇ κελεύσει καὶ αὐθεντίᾳ τοῦ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ., ὅς ἔθετο πρίσταγμα καὶ οὐ παρελεύσεται (LXX. Ps. cxlviii. 6). τοῦ κλείσαντος τὴν ἄβυσσον, καὶ σφραγισμένου αὐτὴν τῷ φοβερῷ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ· εὐλαβεῖσθω (Wisd. xii. 11), πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, ὅτι φοβερός ἐστι, καὶ τίς ἀντιστήσεται αὐτῷ (Wisd. xii. 12) ; καὶ Φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας Θεοῦ ζώντος (Heb. x. 31).

The writer here then combines, as Clement does in § 27 (*vid. sup.* p. 111), LXX. Ps. cxlviii. 6 with Wisd. xii. 12. The first text is obviously used, and the εὐλαβεῖσθω (εὐλαβούμενος, ver. 11) sufficiently shows the τίς ἀντιστήσεται to be taken from Wisdom. Clement begins § 27 with ταύτη οὖν τῇ ἐλπίδι προσδεδέσθωσαν αἱ ψυχαὶ ἡμῶν τῷ πιστῷ ἐν ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις. Comp. κατέχωμεν τὸν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῇ. πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγελιάμενος. Heb. x. 23. (Comp. Clem. *Ep.* ii. 11, *vid. sup.* p. 72.) Observe Clement's manipulation of the verse, and that ver. 31 is quoted in *Theophilus*. Comp. also the εὐαγγελίων πίστις of *Diognet.* xi. (*vid. sup.* p. 114). With the ὁ κελύων λόγος of *Diognet.* xi. also compare the κελεύσει κ.τ.λ. of *Theophilus*. The whole section in *Theophilus* is, indeed, in many respects parallel to *Diognet.* xi. The points, however, which the two writings have in common with one another, are more fully developed in *Theophilus*.

Ἐπόμενοι, the writer says, τῷ ὄρω τῶν . . . πατέρων . . . κατὰ τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παραδόσεις, and the ancient customs of the churches, τὰς τιμίας εἰκόνας ἀσπαζόμεθα. This is the πίστις τῶν ἀποστόλων which enlightened the churches. If any dare to set aside any of the things—whether the form of the cross or the images and pictures—handed down to the Holy Church, according to the ancient customs of the fathers and godly kings, let them, if priests, be deposed and anathematized : εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες καὶ λαϊκοί εἰσι τῷ αὐτῷ ἀναθέματι κατακρίνεσθαι, καὶ τῆς θείας κοινωνίας ἀφορίζεσθαι. Comp. with *Diognet.* xi. If we look a few lines higher up in the preceding section, we

find more details, and specially that the εὐαγγελίων¹ πίστις of Diognetus is developed into τιμῇ καὶ σεβασμιότητι ἐπίσης τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ τῶν θεολέκτων Ἑυαγγελίων κατασπαζόμεθα. It is, of course, the connection of *Theophilus* with Clement, which has just been observed, which gives importance to the parallel now pointed out.

The parallel, or rather the contrast between *Theophilus* and Clement is much stronger. The ὁ τῆς παραδόσεως κανὼν of § 7 (*vid. sup.* p. 108) is mightily developed. The τὸ τίμιον αἶμα, on which faith should gaze, has become τὰς τιμίας εἰκόνας. The teachings of the past are no longer to be studied for lessons of repentance, but for precepts of image-worship. It is no longer the ἀλλότριος τοῦ Θεός (§ 7) who is saved, although he is such, but the ἀλλότριος τῆς Χριστιανικῆς προσηγορίας who is condemned, because he rejects the images. There is no mention here made τῶν δεδογματισμένων, by GOD, which shall not pass away (as in § 27); but τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν (*obs.*) δεδογματισμένων θεοπνεύστων λόγων (concerning the "cultus" of images) not to be transgressed without pains and penalties.

It was, observe, the coincidence between *Theophilus* and Clement in the use of Holy Scripture, which led us to examine Clement's context.

So far we have simply compared those portions of Clement's *Ep.* i. which were in our hands with the close of *Theophilus*. If we look elsewhere in Clement, we shall find irresistible evidence as to the general correctness of the line we are taking. We use, observe, the same page of *Theophilus*.

In § 40 Clement contends that "all things" should be done "decently and in order." He says that, as men who have peered into the depths of the divine knowledge (*comp. the Study of Antiquity*), we ought to do whatever the Master ἐκέλευσεν (*comp. κελεύσει κ.τ.λ.*), not when and where we please, ἀλλ' ὀρισμένοις (*comp. ὀρίζομεν*) καιροῖς. If we do, all will be well: τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τοῦ δεσπότητος ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ διαμαρτάνουσιν. For to the high priest, and priests and Levites, to each is given his own office and ministry. But ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται. *Comp. the ἐπόμενοι*

¹ This is more pointedly expressed in § 2 (which is a summary of §§ 30, 31): ὡσαύτως καὶ τὰς τιμίας εἰκόνας ἀσπαζόμεθα ἐπίσης τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ τῶν θεολέκτων Ἑυαγγελίων. . . αὕτη ἡ πίστις τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐφώτισε.

τῷ ὄρω κ.τ.λ., and the λαῖκοί, who are condemned to *the same anathema* as the priests (*vid. sup.* p. 117). One is apt to think that a layman, or laymen, who rebelled against priestly assumption had some hand in the composition of Clement's *Ep.* i.

In § 41 the subject of § 40 is followed up. The sentence μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὀρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, might be supposed (perhaps it was so intended) to be the parent of many more of like character in later times. This section ends with οἱ οὖν παρὰ τὸ καθήκον τῆς βουλῆσεως αὐτοῦ (obs.) ποιοῦντές τι θάνατον τὸ πρόστιμον ἔχουσιν ὁρᾶτε, ἀδελφοί, ὅσα πλείονος κατηξιώθημεν γνώσεως, τοσούτω μᾶλλον ὑποκειμένα κινδύνῳ. Comp. πόσα μᾶλλον χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας, ὁ τὸν Χριστοῦ χαρακτῆρα (taking the place of "the blood of the covenant" of Hebrews, and of "the will of God" of Clement) τοῦ καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἀγιάσαντος ἀθετῶν, ἢ ἀπαναινόμενος; ὡς τέλειος ἀποστάτης, καὶ ἀλλότριος τῆς Χριστιανικῆς προσηγορίας, ἐνοχος καὶ ὑπόδικος ἔσται αἰώνιου κατακρίσεως. This is a plain parody of Heb. x. 28, 29. It is no less plain that Clement is using the same chapter, but more guardedly. In ver. 25 we find καὶ τοσούτω μᾶλλον ὅσα; in ver. 36 ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαντες (or vv. 7, 9); in ver. 8 ὅτι θυσίαν . . . καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας . . . αἵτινες κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέρονται (comp. οὐ πανταχοῦ προσφέρονται θυσίαι ἐνδελεχισμοῦ ἢ εὐχῶν ἢ περὶ ἁμαρτίας in same § 41); in ver. 2 διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνειδήσιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας (comp. εὐχαριστεῖτω ("the allusion here is plainly to the public services of the church." Lightfoot) Θεῷ ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων).

In § 42 Clement says that the apostles μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐξῆλθον (obs.). Comp. προσερχόμεθα (obs.) . . . ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως, ἐρραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς. Heb. x. 22. Comp. further with the last words of Clement from § 41. In *Theophilus* we have πρὸς δὲ περισσοτέραν πληροφορίαν . . . τῆς πίστεως.

In § 43 Clement tells the story of "Aaron's rod that budded," and has τῷ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματι, and after two lines καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὰς (ῥάβδους) ἔδησεν, καὶ ἐσφράγισεν; and after two lines καὶ κλείσας τὴν σκηνὴν ἐσφράγισεν τὰς κλεῖδας. Comp. the τοῦ κλείσαντος τὴν ἄβυσσον, καὶ σφραγισαμένου αὐτὴν τῷ φοβερῷ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, quoted above (p. 117), from the close of *Theophilus*. Our readers should turn back to the whole

passage, and observe once more the coincidences between it and § 27. The close connection between Clement's *Ep.* i. and *Theophilus* cannot be denied.

The writer of *Theophilus*, however, used the *Oratio Manassis*, found in *Apost. Const.* ii. 22. Comp. ὁ κλείσας τὴν ἄβυσσον καὶ σφραγισάμενος αὐτὴν τῷ φοβερῷ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματί σου. It seems hardly less plain that Clement was indebted to the same source. On ἔδῃσεν κ.τ.λ. (see the words just given from Clement), Lightfoot remarks: "This incident, with the following, ἐσφράγισεν τὰς κλεῖδας ὡσαύτως, is not given in the Biblical narrative" (*Num.* xvii.). It happens, however, to be said in the *Apost. Const.*, a few lines above the words just given, καὶ κατελάβοντο τὸν Μανασσῆν ἐν δεσμοῖς καὶ ἔδῃσαν αὐτὸν ἐν πέδαις χαλκαῖς καὶ κ.τ.λ. A great many suspicious circumstances connected with Clement's § 43 have been pointed out on p. 56 sq.; and when to those circumstances is added the close connection just pointed out between §§ 27, 40, 41, 42, 43 and *Theophilus*, in the very place where the *Oratio Manassis* is used, the conclusion seems necessarily to follow that Clement used the *Oratio*, and that his § 43 is mere jesting. From what was shown on p. 118 with reference to § 40, we shall naturally infer that it was "the keys,"¹ of which S. Peter was the bearer (as Cyril says), that the writer of Clement's epistle mocked at as the emblems of an authority against which he rebelled.

There are some further indications of Clement's use of the *Orat. Manass.* It has παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ . . . καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου ὤρισας μετάνοιαν ἁμαρτωλοῖς εἰς σωτηρίαν . . . καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος ἀνενίσαι καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ πλήθους τῶν ἀδικιῶν μου, κατακαμπτόμενος . . . καὶ νῦν κλίνω γόνου καρδίας μου. Compare with § 7, quoted on p. 108; and, further, with ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὰ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν, followed immediately by οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας, § 36; and with . . . εἰς μετάνοιαν κάμψαντες τὰ γόνατα τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν, § 57. Observe the κατακαμπτόμενος of the *Orat. Manass.* In § 19 ἀτενίσωμεν is followed immediately by ἰδῶμεν, and τοῖς ὀμμασιν τῆς ψυχῆς.

¹ We have, of course, a reference to the "keys" in *Theophilus*, but not in the hands of S. Peter: τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὁρθόδοξων δογμάτων τὰς κλεῖς κατέχοντες τοιαῦτα ὑπογράφου. The writer has quoted, as Cyril does in *Cat.* vi. 15, S. Matt. xviii. 19. See further on in this section.

In § 16 Clement has *ταπεινοφρονούντων γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός*. Comp. the *Θεὸς τῶν μετανοούντων* of *Orat. Manass.*

If we look back and observe the resemblances in *Theophilus* to Clement's *Ep.* i., which have been pointed out, and also the marked differences between the two writings at those points where they most resemble one another, it would seem that the theory which we ventured to propound on p. 116 has found some support. It will be said, however, Where is the *χάρις*?

In *Theoph.* vii. p. 632, the writer says that time would fail (*ἐκλείψει*) him if he endeavoured to tell all (the decrees on image-worship) that had been laid down by the *προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων καὶ πατέρων καὶ διδασκάλων*. . . οὐδὲν γὰρ λέληθε τοὺς πνευματοφόρους¹ καὶ θεόπτας ἀποστόλους. ἀλλ' ἅπερ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν (comp. here with the beginning of § 8, *vid. sup.* p. 108), ἐν νόμῳ καὶ προφήταις καὶ εὐαγγελίοις, ταῦτα καὶ ἐδίδασκαν, ταῦτα καὶ παρέδωκαν ταῦτα καὶ ἐκόσμησαν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀπὸ περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης κ.τ.λ. These last words are found in LXX. Ps. xviii. 4, a psalm which has ever been associated with the apostles. Clement's junction of the decrees of God (obs.) to οὐδὲν λέληθεν in § 27 (*vid. sup.* p. 111), followed by LXX. Ps. xviii. 1-3, has thus a parallel in *Theophilus*. Now, observe, in this passage thus in contact with Clement are found the "law," the "prophets," the "gospels," the "church," just as they stand in *Diognet.* xi. There are, also, the "traditions of the apostles," the "preaching of the apostles," and also διδάσκαλος. Earlier, in *Diognet.* xi., we have διδάσκαλος, τὰ παραδοθέντα, διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρυχθείς. In the beginning of *Diognet.* xii. the writer speaks of those who become "a paradise of delight:" καρποῖς κεκοσμημένοι. Comp. the ἐκόσμησαν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἐκκλησίαν of *Theophilus*. These² coincidences are surely noteworthy.

A little above in *Theoph.* vi., p. 632, the writer has πρόσφυγον γεγονότα τῇ τῆς Θεομήτορος σεπτῇ εἰκόνι. Comp. τοὺς προσπεφυγότας τοῖς οἰκτιρμοῖς αὐτοῦ. *Ep.* i. 20. Clement

¹ These epithets make the transfer of the language from God to the apostles more pointed, for they may be thought to be an attempt to explain and justify the transfer.

² The way in which they have been found should be carefully observed. While remarking the coincidences between *Theophilus* and Clement, we remark also those between *Theophilus* and *Diognetus*. This is the second instance of this double connection (*vid. sup.* p. 117).

follows this, as in *Theophilus*, after a few lines, by οὐδὲν λέληθεν, applied as before to God. Higher up in § 20, Clement has μηδὲ ἀλλοιοῦσά τι τῶν δεδογματισμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (obs.). Compare with the foregoing, and note the change from the mercies of God to the image of the Virgin.

In the preceding section (*Theoph.* v., p. 632) the writer tells the well-known story of King Abgarus. He proceeds:—

ὅπερ ἐκμαγεῖον μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡ λαμπροτάτη καὶ μεγαλάνυμος (obs.) τῶν Ἐδεσσηνῶν πόλιν ὥσπερ σκῆπτρον βασιλικὸν κατέχουσα, αὐχρῇ καὶ κομπαῖζει· σημεῖα ἐν δὲ τῷ λαῷ δεικνύοντος, τοῦ ταύτην αὐτῇ τὴν χάριν παρασχομένου Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ.

Comp. Clement's § 16: ταπεινοφρονούντων γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, οὐκ ἐπαυρομένων ἐπὶ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ· τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Κύριος Ἰ. Χ., οὐκ ἤλθεν ἐν κόμπῳ ἀλαζονείας οὐδὲ ὑπερηφανείας, καίπερ δυνάμενος· ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονῶν, καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐλάλησε· Φησὶ γὰρ Κύριε κ.τ.λ. Isa. liii.

Observe the transfer to the likeness of the Lord, and mark the χάριν of *Theophilus*. Comp. also the ἅπερ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν in a passage from *Theophilus*, given above, and from the same page as that in which the present passage stands.

In the preceding section (§ 4), the writer says that S. Luke carved out and painted a likeness of the Virgin Mary while she was still alive, and that when this was shown to her she said: ἡ χάρις μου μετ' αὐτῆς ἔσται. Here, then, we find the χάρις of Clement and *Diognetus* taken up in a sufficiently pointed way. A little above, in the preceding section (§ 3), we remark ὁ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ μη ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγάγων, ὁ τὰς . . . δυνάμεις τῷ λόγῳ συστησάμενος. Comp. with § 27 given on p. 111. Lightfoot quotes *Philo*, ii. p. 367 τὰ γὰρ μη ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι, and *Clem. Hom.* iii. 32 τῷ τὰ μη ὄντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι συστησαμένῳ. Compare.

The words just quoted from Clement's § 16 are very remarkable. The wonder is that they never became "household words" in the church. Jerome quotes them on Isa. lii. 13, p. 612, or seems to do so, but even this does not appear to have directed attention to them. In illustration of them, Lightfoot refers to *Phil.* ii. 6 sq. and LXX. Ps. xlv. 6 ὁ ῥάβδος ἐυθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου. The first of these passages is partly cited by Jerome in his context, as also by Eusebius

(on the same verse), whose *Commentary on Isaiah* Jerome everywhere uses in his own exposition. LXX. Ps. xlv. 6 is not quoted by either of them, but Jerome *does* cite verse 4, and, in explaining it, makes use of Eusebius' comments thereupon, to which we shall have occasion presently to refer. Both Eusebius and Jerome, moreover, explain the "dry ground," or rather Aquila's ἀπὸ γῆς ἀβάτου of Isa. lii. 2 of the Virgin, and they both quote Isa. xi. 1 καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης Ἰεσσαί, καὶ ἄνθος ἐκ τοῦ ῥίζης ἀναβήσεται.

It will be profitable to turn to some commentaries on Isa. xi. 1.

The last sentence of Eusebius' comment on LXX. Ps. xliii. contains two quotations. One of these is LXX. Ps. xxxvi. 35 εἶδον τὸν ἀσεβῆ ὑπερυφούμενον καὶ ἐπαιρόμενον κ.τ.λ. Comp. the ἐπαιρομένων of the opening words of § 16, given above. The writer of Clement's epistle himself¹ gives the verse in § 14. Eusebius might have given the hint. On Isa. xi. 1 Eusebius has ἦτις ῥάβδος (Christ), πάντας τοὺς ὑψηλοὺς συντρίψασα, ταπεινώσει. Comp. with § 16.

Jerome on Isa. xi. 1 writes thus:—

"Virgam et florem de radice Jesse, ipsum Dominum Judæi interpretantur; quod scilicet in virga regnantis potentia, in flore pulchritudo monstretur. Nos autem virgam de radice Jesse sanctam Mariam Virginem intelligamus, quæ nullum habuit sibi fruticem cohærentem; . . . et florem Dominum Salvatorem, qui dicit in Canticis Canticorum.—*Ego flos campi* (πεδίου) *et lilium convallium* (Cant. ii. 1)."

¹ Clement adds the following verse: καὶ παρήλθον καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ἐξεζήτησα τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐχ εἶδον. The LXX. has καὶ ἐζήτησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐχ εἰρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ. Eusebius throws no light upon the variation. Didymus, however, in his *Expos. in Ps.*, supplies a possible explanation. He does not quote the verse, but has παρελθών, φησί, τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸν μέλλοντα βίον, οὐκ εἶδ' εἶδον (obs.) τὸν ἀσεβῆ, ὡς ζητῆσαι (obs.) τὸν τόπον. This suggests that Clement's is a mere "fancy" reading. The greatest pains seems to be taken in his epistles to find curious readings. When they could not be found, they could, of course, be made. Clement's quotation here is one of six, which, "without hinting that he is quoting from a previous writer, Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* iv. 6 (p. 577), strings together. . . He ends this string of quotations with the very words of the Roman Clement, ταπεινοφρονούντων γὰρ . . . τὸ πόριμον αὐτοῦ (§ 16), without any indication that he is citing from another" (Lightfoot). One of these quotations has a "remarkable omission." This *peculiarity* is found also in our Clement. The Alexandrian gives the LXX. version of Ps. xxxvi. 36. Our Clement prefers his own *peculiar* version.

On this we remark that the *ράβδος*, or *σκῆπτρον*, is applied *with the Jews* by Clement in § 16 to our Lord, in *Theophilus* (as above) to our Lord's likeness. The writer of *Theophilus*, however, uses *σκῆπτρον βασιλικόν* again (in § 30), and then applies the expression to the likeness of the Virgin Mary and the infant Saviour: *τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς . . . Μαρίας, καὶ τοῦ ἐξ αὐτῆς σαρκωθέντος καὶ νηπιάσαντος Θεοῦ Λόγου, ὡς καύχημα πίστεως καὶ στέφανον* (Isa. lxii. 3) *κάλλους, καὶ σκῆπτρον βασιλικόν κ.τ.λ.* With *ἐξ αὐτῆς*, comp. *ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης* of Isa. xi. 1. For *κάλλους*, see Isa. liii. 2. Both Jerome and Eusebius take special note of the word,—the one in his comment on Isaiah, the other in his comment on the psalm,—as we shall see presently (*vid. infr.* p. 126). *Νηπιάζειν* is not a common word, and must have been chosen advisedly. Comp. the *ὡς παιδίον* (or *ὡς θηλάζων* of Theodotion) in Isa. liii. 2. It happens that Clement in C reads *πεδίον*. Comp. the *πεδίου* of Cant. ii. 1, quoted by Jerome in Isa. xi. 1.

Basil's *Commentary* on the first sixteen chapters of Isaiah is incomplete, in that we have only an *Enarratio in aliquot loca xi. et xii. capituli Isaiaë*. He begins with ver. 10, but thereon he explains ver. 1 of Christ, and says: *ὅτι*¹ *ἐν βραχεῖ τὴν χάριν παρασχόμενος τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως, ταχέϊαν καὶ οἰονεὶ παροδικὴν ποιεῖται τὴν ἐπιδημίαν.* Comp. the *τὴν χάριν παρασχομένου Χριστοῦ* of *Theophilus*, and mark the transfer of *χάριν* from

¹ Three lines below *ἐν βραχεῖ*, we find *οὐχί φησι, Δόξει· οὐδὲ, Δόξει εἶναι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν* ("ita mss. omnes. Editi, οὐχί, φασί, δόξα, οὐδὲ δόξη, *hand emendate*," note at foot). Comp. *ὡς βραχεῖ λόγῳ περιλαβεῖν, πρὸς ἀλήθειαν μὲν οὐδεπώποτε ἀποβλέψαντος, ἐπὶ δόξῃ δέ, καὶ τῷ παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν ἐπαίνῳ ἅπαντα εἰπόντος αἰεὶ, καὶ πρᾶξαντος, ὡς καὶ εἰς πῦρ ἀλίσθαι, ὅτι μὴδ' ἀπολαύειν τῶν ἐπαίνων ἔμιλλεν, ἀναισθητος αὐτῶν γενόμενος.* *Peregrin.* 42. Further on Basil has *ἀπολαῦσαι . . . αἰσθανόμενος* (obs.) *τῆς εὐεργεσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καυχῆσεται ἐπ' αὐτῇ καὶ φησιν. Ἰδοὺ ὁ Θεός μου, Σωτήρ μου, πεποιθώς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐ φοβηθήσομαι, διότι ἡ δόξα μου καὶ ἡ αἰνεσίς μου Κυρίου. Ταῦτα οὐκ ἔρουσιν* (obs.) *οἱ ποιοῦντες* (obs.) *τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ οἱ δόξαν παρ' ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητοῦντες, καὶ ὅλως οἱ παραβαίνοντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ λέγοντος* (obs.) *Μὴ γενώμεθα* (obs.) *κενόδοξοι.* The coincidences here cannot be accidental.

Further on Basil (p. 573) has *Βούτι οὖν ἀντὶ τοῦ, Μὴ μικρὰ περὶ Θεοῦ φρονεῖτε, ἀλλὰ μεγάλη τῇ διανοίᾳ τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐνοοῦντες, οὕτω θεολογεῖτε, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς μακρὰν οὖσι τῆς σωτηρίας δυνῆσθαι ἐξακουστον* (obs.) *ὑμῶν τὸν λόγον.* Comp. *οὕτως δεῖ ἡμᾶς φρονεῖν περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς περὶ Θεοῦ, ὡς περὶ κριτοῦ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν· καὶ οὐ δεῖ ἡμᾶς μικρὰ φρονεῖν περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν· ἐν τῷ γὰρ φρονεῖν ἡμᾶς μικρὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ, μικρὰ καὶ ἐλπίζομεν λαβεῖν· καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες* (obs.) κ.τ.λ., Clem. ii. 1. We found just now a coincidence in *Theophilus* for the same section, and coincidences between *Peregrin.* 19 and the same section will be pointed out hereafter.

the incarnation of Christ to His likeness. Ἐνάνθρωπῃσις is twice used in *Theophilus* in the near neighbourhood.

LXX. Ps. xlv. 6, to which Lightfoot refers, is a very obvious parallel to Clement's words in § 16, more obvious in the *Hexapla* than in the LXX., for Aquila has σκῆπτρον εὐθύτητος σκῆπτρον τῆς βασιλείας σου. If we turn to Eusebius' comment on that verse, we find that he quotes it, and adds οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ σκολιὸν οὐδὲ στραγγαλιῶδες. This is said in Prov. viii. 8 of Wisdom's words. The sentence, however, which is here, observe, tacked on by Eusebius to "the sceptre of the kingdom," is in *Theoph.* ii. (which is a summary of the two concluding sections) applied to the church: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ σκολ. κ.τ.λ. The change here made is as pointed as it can possibly be. The writer proceeds: πάντα γὰρ εὐθεῖα τοῖς νοοῦσι, καὶ ὀρθὰ τοῖς εὐρίσκουσι γινῶσιν· ὅλη γὰρ καλή κ.τ.λ. Prov. viii. 9, however, runs: πάντα ἐνώπια τοῖς συνιοῦσι, καὶ ὀρθὰ τοῖς εὐρίσκουσι γινῶσιν. Nothing can well be plainer than that εὐθεῖα is taken from the εὐθύτητος of the psalm, or rather of Eusebius' comment on the psalm. The αὐτῷ of Eusebius is the τὸν Ἀγαπητὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, to whom the epithet καλός is applied. Νοήσεις is in the same place. It is quite impossible that these coincidences, thus grouped around the "rod" or "sceptre," can have accidentally arisen.

We must return to Eusebius' comments on LXX. Ps. lxiv., which are full of interest to any one who desires to unravel the mysteries of the writings which we are examining.

In § 28, a few lines after the passage in § 27 which is in such close contact with *Theophilus*, Clement has λέγει γὰρ που τὸ γραφεῖον. The last word (which commonly means "a pen") has excited much attention, and the editors have pointed, in explanation of it, to the threefold division of the Old Testament scriptures into "the law," "the prophets," and ἀγίόγραφα or γραφεῖα. They do not, however, give any example of the use of the singular γραφεῖον in this sense. Thus Suicer, in his *Thesaurus*, discusses not γραφεῖον, but γραφεῖα. He did not believe in the authenticity of the epistles bearing Clement's name, and therefore does not cite the passage before us.

Eusebius discusses the words from LXX. Ps. xlv. 1 ἡ γλῶσσά μου κάλαμος γραμματέως ὀξύγραφου. He points out that Symmachus read γραφεῖον instead of κάλαμος. He gives

what we may call his theory of inspiration. The pen is the tongue of the prophets. There is the Holy Spirit, there is the prophet, καὶ τρίτον τὴν γλῶσσαν τὴν προφητικὴν, ἢ καλάμου καὶ γραφείου χώραν ἐπεῖχεν, ὄργανον τυγχάνουσα τοῦ χρωμένου αὐτῇ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. The word γραφεῖον is thus equivalent to the common ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, and which Clement has in *Ep.* ii. 11. That we have here the true history of Clement's use of the word seems probable from some further considerations.

Eusebius goes on to show that the words ὡραῖος κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων which follow, are necessarily connected in the LXX. with ἡ γλῶσσά μου κ.τ.λ. In the Hebrew, however, and in the other versions, there is, he says, no such connection, the words "the tongue, etc." forming an introduction to an ode to the Beloved. On His beauty Eusebius dilates, combining the various versions in one sentence: ὡραῖος εἰ κάλλει, καλὸς εἶ, ἢ κάλλει ἐκαλλιώθης, ἢ κάλλει ὡραιώθης, ὦ Ἀγαπητέ, παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. He was one of the sons of men, and numbered with τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς πολιτευσαμένοις, but there was no beauty to be compared to His. In *Theophilus*, in the first σκῆπτρον βασιλικόν passage (obs.), our Lord is said to have been ἐπὶ γῆς ἔτι πολιτευόμενος. Eusebius goes on to show that the κάλλος was not of the body, but τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, and that the psalm is not contradicted by the words of Isa. liii. 2 καὶ ἵδομεν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος· ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἄτιμον, ἐκλείπον παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. The LXX. reads εἶδομεν, and inserts καὶ before ἐκλείπον. Here, then, Eusebius is enlarging upon the κάλλος of the Lord, and showing that in this particular verse of Isa. liii. there is no contradiction with the psalm. Verse 6 of the psalm is the verse to which Lightfoot refers in illustration of the words in § 16, with which Clement introduces Isa. liii. Exactly at this point we have shown a coincidence with *Theophilus*, which applies the words of Clement in § 16 to the likeness of our Lord. In *Theoph.* iii. a very elaborate description is given of our Lord's person. Epithet is piled upon epithet, and phrase upon phrase. Among these we observe σιτόχρουν τῷ εἶδει (obs.) κατὰ τὴν μητρῶαν (obs.) ἐμφάνειαν μακροδάκτυλον . . . καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια τῆς ἀρετῆς (comp. with Eusebius) κ.τ.λ. We turn then, now, to Clement's version of

Isa. liii. 2 καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἄτιμον, ἐκλείπον παρὰ τὸ εἶδος τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Mark the change here of τοὺς υἱοὺς (obs. the παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων of the psalm) into τὸ εἶδος. Comp. with *Theophilus*, and note the contrast between μητράαν and ἀνθρώπων. Observe also that Clement omits καὶ before ἐκλείπον, as Eusebius does. It must be observed that εἶδος is the reading of both of the Greek mss. (A. C.) of Clement's epistle, but it is a reading which cannot be found elsewhere. Does it not seem as if it had been deliberately adopted¹ in jest?

Eusebius, however, proceeds with ver. 2 ἐξεχύθη ἡ χάρις ἐν χεῖρεσί σου· διὰ τοῦτο εὐλόγησέ σε ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Μαῦσῃς μὲν οὖν εὗρε μίαν τινὰ χάριν· καὶ Νῶε πάλιν εὗρε τινα χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ἕκαστος τῶν δικαίων χάριτος μετέσχεν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἀγαπητοῦ πᾶσα ἡ πατρικὴ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκενώθη χάρις. Can it be that we have here the passage on χάρις, which first of all excited the mirth of our writers? Comp. the πάντας οὖν τοὺς ἀγαπητοὺς (obs. the Ἀγαπητός of Eusebius) αὐτοῦ βουλόμενος μετανοίας μετασχεῖν, of the close of § 8, quoted on p. 109, remembering the τὸ αἶμα . . . ἐκχυθέν (comp. the ἐξεχύθη ἡ χάρις of the psalm) . . . μετανοίας χάριν ἐπήνεγκεν, and the οἱ λειτουργοὶ τῆς χάριτος which precede (*vid. sup.* p. 109). Clement goes on to bid us to become ἰκέται of His pity; and Eusebius to say that those who have wept καὶ τὴν ὑπὸ τοῖς πολεμίοις δουλείαν ἑαυτῶν ὑπογράψαντες (obs.), εὐκαίρως τὸν Ἀγαπητὸν ἰκετεύουσι . . . ἐλθεῖν . . . ὥς ἂν . . . τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῖς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπεξαγάγοι. In § 16, after the quotation of Isa. liii., Clement has ὁρᾶτε, ἄνδρες ἀγαπητοί,

¹ Clement's version of Isa. liii. shows several other divergences from the LXX., all of which are capable of explanation. One of them, an interpolated πόνος, seems to be a jest no less than εἶδος. It is a jest founded on one meaning which Jerome gives to a πόνος, which is in the LXX. version. The proof of this would carry us into writings which do not now concern us.

The explanation of another divergence from the LXX. is close at hand. Eusebius, in Isa. liii. 6, reads with the LXX. καὶ Κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν; but in his comment thereon he has αὐτὸς γὰρ ἑαυτὸν παρὶδίδου ὁ Κύριος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἀντίψυχον καὶ ἀντίλυτρον ἡμῶν. Clement accordingly reads ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁ. ἡ. Comp. the parallel passage in *Diognet.* x. αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν ἀπὸδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. The ἀντί of the ἀντίλυτρον of the N. T. and Eusebius is dropped, and ὑπὲρ is made very emphatic by being repeated six times.

τίς ὁ ὑπογραμμὸς (obs.) ὁ δεδομένος ἡμῖν· εἰ γὰρ ὁ κύριος οὕτως ἐταπεινοφρόνησεν, τί ποιήσωμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἑλθόντες; obs. and comp. the paradoxical expression ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος. The history of this can be given, but it would lead us to writings with which we have no immediate concern.

Other things in this psalm we must pass by, and turn to ver. 1 of LXX. Ps. lxxiii., a psalm almost as interesting for our purposes as Ps. xlv.

Clement's § 29 runs thus:—

προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν οσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἀγνᾶς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀγαπῶντες τὸν ἐπεικῆ καὶ εὖσπλαγχνον πατέρα ἡμῶν ὃς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ. Οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται· "Ὅτε διεμέριζεν κ.τ.λ. Deut. xxxii. 8, 9: καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει· Ἰδοὺ Κύριος λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν, ὥσπερ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἄλλω, καὶ ἐξελεύσεται (Isa. xi. 1) ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἄγια ἀγίαν. § 30: ἀγίου οὖν μερίς ὑπάρχοντες κ.τ.λ.

Eusebius, in his comment on LXX. Ps. lxxiii. 1, describes God's dealings with "the sheep of His pasture,"—His chastisements, and yet His long-suffering kindness. Thus he quotes S. Matt. xxiii. 37, 38 ("How often would I have gathered," etc.), and says that the "how often" points out the long-suffering of God. He then quotes ver. 2 of the psalm: *μνησθητι τῆς συναγωγῆς σου, ἧς ἐκτήσω ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* (obs.). This "synagogue" he describes as *ἡ δὲ τὸ ἐξαίρετον παριστᾶσα τῆς ἐκλογῆς ἡ Ἐκκλησία* (comp.). He gives the reason why the first "synagogue" was cast out, quoting LXX. Ps. xxi. 17–19. He then proceeds with ver. 2 of the psalm: *ἐλυτρώσω ῥάβδον κληρονομίας σου· δυσωπητικῶς· Σὺ γὰρ, φησίν, ταύτην ἐλυτρώσω τὴν συναγωγὴν καταξιάσας αὐτὴν σὴν χρηματίσαι μερίδα καὶ ῥάβδον κληρονομίας σου·* "Ὅτε γὰρ διεμέριζεν κ.τ.λ., Deut. xxxii. 8, 9. Eusebius then says that Aquila for ῥάβδον in the psalm read *σκήπτρον*; but Symmachus *σκήπτρον κληρουχίας σου· διδάσκοντος τοῦ λόγου πάντας μὲν ἀνθρώπους εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν δὲ ἁφωρισμένον αὐτοῦ λαὸν ὥσπερ βασιλικὸν αὐτοῦ σκήπτρον γεγονέναι*. It cannot be denied that we have here before us amply sufficient hints for Clement's § 29. Now observe, Eusebius immediately continues the psalm: *ὅρος Σιών τοῦτο, ὃ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν αὐτῷ, Ἐπαρον τὰς χεῖράς σου κ.τ.λ.* Accordingly Clement has, as we see above, *χεῖρας αἴροντες*, looking at

1 Tim. ii. 8, ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας, yet altering the first word into αἵροντες, and ὁσίους into ἐν ὁσιότητι τῆς ψυχῆς, and substituting ἀγνὰς καὶ ἀμεινάντους χεῖρας from the familiar liturgical expression, being moved thereto by Deut. xxxii. 6 (Clement quotes vv. 8, 9) οὐκ αὐτὸς οὗτός σου πατήρ (Clement takes the word) ἐκτίσαστό σε καὶ ἐποίησέ σε καὶ ἐπλασέ σε. Comp. Clement's own ἄνθρωπον ταῖς ἱεραῖς καὶ ἀμώμοις χερσὶν ἔπλασεν, § 33, or ὁ χερσὶν ἀχράντοις τὸν ἄνθρωπον πλάσας, *Theoph.* iii.

Eusebius goes on to quote Heb. xii. 22 προσελήλυθατε Σιών ὄρει κ.τ.λ. Accordingly Clement begins § 29 with προσέλθωμεν. We came to this 73d Psalm, observe, simply because of the ῥάβδον κληρονομίας in ver. 2.

The coincidence with *Theophilus* in σκῆπτρον βασιλικόν of course sends us to that writing. In § 7, just below a passage quoted on p. 121, we remark τὰ σκῆπτρα τῆς βασιλείας (Ps. xliv.), in the next line τῆς μεγάλης ῥίζης (Isa. xi. 1, liii. 2) στύλους τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν . . . κατέρῥαξε, and, after four lines, ἀνθρώποις . . . ἐναγέσι τὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἅγια ἐνεχειρίσατο. Here, in Eusebius, we have σκῆπτρον βασιλείας . . . κατέρῥαξαν αὐτήν (Zion) . . . ἐναγέσιν; and comp. Clement's ἅγια ἁγίων in § 29, also οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιοτάτοι στύλοι ἐδιώχθησαν, § 5. One of these was S. Paul, whom Clement describes as κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ κ.τ.λ. In *Theoph.* i. we find ὁ μέγας Παῦλος καὶ κήρυξ τῆς οἰκουμένης καὶ διδάσκαλος, looking at 1 Tim. ii. 7, where S. Paul speaks of himself as κήρυξ and διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν. This last expression is found in *Diognet.* xi.

We shall now take our leave of *Theophilus* for the present. Our readers, we imagine, will be prepared to say that it was certainly not written by Christopher, the Patriarch of Alexandria, but by some later author, who was at considerable pains to transfer the language of the writings from which he borrowed from their own subjects to what we may call "later theological developments."

Of the coincidences with Clement we say nothing at present. Our readers can draw their own conclusions.

(B.) We have been led very far away from the professed object of this section, and must now return to the examination of Clement's Greek in §§ 7, 8, quoted on p. 108 sq.

(1.) We have pointed out on p. 109 sq. the use in § 7 of

LXX. Ps. cxxxii., followed by the use of LXX. Ps. cxv. It happens that commentaries on these two psalms are found amongst the writings of Basil. They follow one another—and the coincidence is worth observing—for the commentaries on the intervening psalms are missing. They are ascribed to Basil, but the authorship is doubtful. The explanation of Ps. cxv., for example, includes nearly all now found in Didymus' *Expositio*, and in the same words. The question, of course, does not at all concern us.

Basil's exposition of Ps. cxxxii. is very short. The eye falls at once upon τῆς χάριτος ἄνωθεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἐκχεομένης . . . καὶ ἐπήνεγκε λέγων· Ζωὴν ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος. Ἴδου δὲ, τί καλόν, ἢ τί τερπνόν, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ κατοικεῖν ἀδελφοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό; καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε. Εἰς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα· εἰς Θεὸς καὶ Πατήρ. Comp. Clement's language in § 7 (*vid. sup.* p. 108). Obs. the ἐπήνεγκε. Cod. Alex. reads ὑπήνεγκε, which seems to have a history of its own into which we cannot now enter. Obs. also Clement's τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. This is the reading of C. The reading in A. is doubtful, but it was either τῷ Θεῷ πατρί, or τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί. Comp. further § 46 ἢ οὐχὶ ἓνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν καὶ ἓνα Χριστόν; καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ μία κλῆσις ἐν Χριστῷ, where Clement is using (in his own peculiar fashion) Eph. iv. 4 sq., as Basil does. Comp. again with Basil and with Heb. x. 29 τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος, also *vid. sup.* p. 127.

In Basil we remark also ἔνθα ἡ συνέλευσις τῶν πανταχόθεν ἀδελφῶν ἐγίγνετο, with ποιεῖται in the next line but one. In Eusebius' very brief comment on the same verse, we find ὁμόνοια δὲ καὶ εἰρήνη κ.τ.λ. Comp. τά τε ἐλάχιστα τῶν ζώων τὰς συνελεύσεις αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ εἰρήνῃ ποιοῦνται, *Er.* i. 20.

We turn now to Basil's exposition of LXX. Ps. cxv. We shall only notice one coincidence.

Verse 15 is used by Clement. On verse 16 Basil has υἱὸς γάρ εἰμι τῆς παιδίσκης σου (on p. 110 special attention is called to these words as a connecting link between Wisd. ix. 5 and the psalm), ἣν νηπιάζουσιν (*vid. sup.* p. 124) καὶ κομιδῇ παῖδα παραγαγὼν ὁ ἐχθρός, καὶ ἀποστήσας τῆς σῆς δουλείας, δούλην τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐποίησεν. ἀλλ' ἐπιστρέφω καὶ ἐπανατρέχω πρὸς τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Δεσπότην, καὶ ἐπιγινώσκω τὴν ἀρχαίαν δουλείαν. We

have already referred several times to Clement's § 19. Comp. now ἐπαναδράμαμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραδεδόμενον ἡμῖν τῆς εἰρήνης σκοπὸν. In the preceding sentence (for which *vid. sup.* p. 23) is ταπεινοφρονοῦν. Comp. further, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δὲ τεταπεινώτο (obs.) τὸ οἰκετικόν (obs.), ὥστε καὶ ἐβουλεύσαντο ἐπὶ τοὺς κυρίους (obs.) ἐπαναδραμεῖν κ.τ.λ., Phot. *Bibl.* 244, p. 390 (excerpts from Diodorus). These excerpts have already been referred to several times. Ἐπανατρέχειν is a word not at all in common use.

(2.) From Basil we turn to S. Chrysostom *In cap. xii. Matth. Hom.* xliv. Having quoted ver. 41 ("The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment," etc.), he supposes our Lord to contrast Himself with Jonah. He has καὶ ὁ μὲν καταστροφὴν ἐκήρυξεν, ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ., and after three lines ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ δεσπότης καὶ τῶν πάντων κύριος ἦλθον, and after seven lines καὶ ὁ μὲν ξένος τις ἦν καὶ ἀλλότριος, and after one line ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερον προστίθῃσι παράδειγμα λέγων. Comp. the καταστροφὴν ἐκήρυξεν, ἀλλότριος τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄντες, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων, προστιθείς of Clement (*vid. sup.* p. 108).

(3.) The expression ἀγαθὴ γνώμη, which Clement (*vid. sup.* p. 108) uses, is one with which we happen to be very familiar. It is found in the following Greek fragment of Iren. *Hær.* iv. 37, preserved in the *Sacr. Par.* of John of Damascus: βία Θεῷ οὐ πρόσσεστιν, ἀγαθὴ δὲ γνώμη πάντοτε συμπάρεστιν αὐτῷ. The Greek may not be that of Irenæus, but of a late¹ translator from the Latin, which alone has come down to us entire. The old version of Irenæus' sentence is "*Vis enim a Deo non fit, sed bona sententia adest illi semper.*"

The first clause of the sentence as it stands in the *Sacr. Par.* is used in *Diognet.* vii. 4 (see below). A second but longer fragment of the Greek of chap. 37 is also preserved in the *Sacr. Par.* This also contains a coincidence with *Diognetus*. Comp. Irenæus' μαρτυρίας τῆς ἐκλογῆς with μαρτύριον ἐκλογῆς, *Diognet.* iv. 3. Immediately afterwards Irenæus says that the prophets exhort men to do what is right, adding καὶ γνώμης δεομένων ἀγαθῆς, ἣν ὁ ἀγαθὸς Θεὸς παρέσχε γινώσκειν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν (obs.). It cannot be denied that this is an apt illustration of Clement's use of ἀγαθὴ γνώμη. Another exceedingly short fragment of chap. 37 is preserved. The last

¹ This question will be considered at the close of this section.

words are ἀλλὰ μὴ βιαζόμενον. Comp. the οὐ βιαζόμενος of *Diognet.* vii. 4 (below). Only one other very small fragment of the Greek of this rather long chapter remains. The singular fact that those portions of Irenæus' Greek should have been preserved which contain the coincidences is to be observed. We shall now give the passage from *Diognetus* to which we have referred:

(2) . . . τοῦτον πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀπέστειλεν; (3) ἄρά γε, ὡς ἀνθρώπων ἂν τις λογίσαιτο, ἐπὶ τυραννίδι καὶ φόβῳ καὶ καταπλήξει; (4) οὐ μὲν οὖν ἀλλ' ἐν ἐπεικειᾷ, πραύτητι. ὡς βασιλεὺς πέμπαν υἱὸν βασιλεῖα ἔπεμψεν, ὡς Θεὸν ἔπεμψεν, ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔπεμψεν, ὡς σώζων ἔπεμψεν, ὡς πείθων, οὐ βιαζόμενος. βία γὰρ οὐ πρόσσετι τῷ Θεῷ; (5) ἔπεμψεν ὡς καλῶν, οὐ διώκων ἔπεμψεν ὡς ἀγαπῶν, οὐ κρίνων. πέμπει γὰρ αὐτὸν κρίνοντα καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ τὴν παρουσίαν ὑποστήσεται.

This passage is the one to which reference was made on p. 110. We were then examining *Wisd.* xii., and the use which appeared to be made of that chapter in Clement's § 61. We then remarked that Clement used ἐν πραύτητι, while ἐν ἐπεικειᾷ was in *Wisd.* xii. 17. The two words go naturally together, and so here in *Diognet.* vii. we have ἐν ἐπεικειᾷ, πραύτητι. The writer of *Diognetus* in his interrogatory ἐπὶ τυραννίδι, followed by βασιλεὺς, draws a plain distinction between βασιλεὺς and τύραννος. So in *Wisd.* xii. 14 we have οὔτε βασιλεὺς ἢ τύραννος κ.τ.λ. In *Wisd.* xii. 12 we have ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί (obs.) σοι; which is an apt parallel for the conclusion of the passage from *Diognetus* given above. We saw on p. 111 that Clement combined *Wisd.* xii. 12 with *Wisd.* xi. 21 τὸ γὰρ μεγάλως ἰσχύειν πάρεστί σοι πάντοτε, καὶ κρᾶται βραχίονός σου τίς ἀντιστήσεται. Comp. πάρεστί σοι πάντοτε with Irenæus' (?) ἀγαθὴ δὲ γνώμη πάντοτε συμπάρεστιν αὐτῷ. Clement uses the ἀγαθὴ γνώμη; the preceding clause stands here in *Diognet.* vii. No one will deny that these things are very curious.

The passage from *Diognet.* vii. is very carefully compiled from a number of parallel passages, each of which declares as its leading idea that God does not force the will of man. Under the writer's skilful manipulation, its sentences form indeed a "catena" as it were of authorities on the question of man's free-will. One of these authorities is Irenæus, and we have seen that his words appear to be used both by Clement and

the writer of *Diognetus*. We have seen, also, that both writers seem to use the same chapter of Wisdom. It will be proper, therefore, to examine some of the other sources to which *Diognetus* is indebted.

Hippolytus writes:—

οἷς οὐχ ἑνος καιροῦ λόγος ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ διὰ πασῶν (obs.) γενεῶν αἱ τῶν προλεγομένων φωναὶ εὐαπόδεικτοι παρίσταντο . . . διὰ πασῶν γενεῶν . . . ὁδὲ λόγος ἐφθέγγετο λέγων, δι' αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέφων τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ παρακοῆς, οὐ βία ἀνάγκης δουλαγωγῶν, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἐλευθερίαν ἐκουσίῳ προαιρέσει καλῶν (obs.). τοῦτον (obs.) τὸν λόγον ἐν ὑστέροις ἀπέστειλεν ὁ πατήρ, οὐκέτι διὰ προφήτου (obs.) λαλεῖν . . . οὐδὲ δι' ἁγγέλου φοβοῦντα (obs.) ψυχὴν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν (obs.) παρόντα τὸν λελαληκότα. *Refut.* x. 33, p. 542 (Dunck. 1859).

Observe the general parallel with *Diognet.* vii., and note the *φόβῳ* and *καλῶν*. Comp. also with Clement's §§ 7, 8 (given on p. 108), remembering that the *οἱ λειτουργοί* are the prophets.

Clement of Alexandria also writes:—

ταύτη ὁ πάντων Ὁ Κύριος Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ βαρβάρων τοὺς ἐθέλοντας πείθει· οὐ γὰρ βιάζεται τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ σωτηρίαν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ἐλέσθαι. *Strom.* vii. 2, p. 832.

Observe the general parallel with *Diognetus*, and note the *ὡς πείθων*. Our Clement has *ἐλαβον σωτηρίαν* at the close of § 7 (*vid. sup.* p. 108). *Strom.* vii. is unquestionably used in *Diognetus*, notably p. 833 in *Diognet.* ix. and elsewhere. This same page appears to be used also in *Diognet.* vii. Clem. Alex. has *καὶ τοῦ δυναμένου καλῶς τι διέπειν ἀποδεδόσθαι τὴν ἐκείνου διοίκησιν* ἔστιν δὲ τὸ *ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄρχον τε καὶ ἡγεμονοῦν κ.τ.λ.* Comp. *ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἀληθῶς ὁ παντοκράτωρ . . . Θεὸς . . . ἐγκατεστήριξε* (cf. here with the close of § 8, p. 109) *ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν οὐ . . . ἀνθρώποις ὑπῆρέτην τινὰ πέμψας ἢ ἁγγελον ἢ ἄρχοντα ἢ τινὰ τῶν διεπόντων τὰ ἐπίγεια ἢ τινὰ τῶν πεπιστευμένων τὰς ἐν οὐρανοῖς διοικήσεις*, *Diognet.* vii. 2. Comp. further, *εἰς τὸ διέπειν αὐτοὺς τὴν ὑπὸ σοῦ δεδομένην αὐτοῖς ἡγεμονίαν ἀπροσκόπως*, Clem. *Ep.* i. 61. In *Strom.* vii. 7, p. 857, *τὸ παντοκρατορικὸν βούλημα*, used in § 8, p. 109, is found.

Clement of Alexandria writes in another place:—

δίδωσι δὲ βουλομένοις καὶ ὑπερσπουδακόσι καὶ δεομένοις, ἢ οὕτως ἴδιος αὐτοῦ ἡ σωτηρία γένηται, οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκάζει ὁ Θεός, βία γὰρ ἐχθρὸν Θεῷ. *Quis div. salv.* x. p. 940, with *ὁ γοῦν Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐλέγχει μὲν αὐτόν, . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγαπᾷ κ.τ.λ.*, just above in § 9, p. 940.

Compare the leading idea with *Diognetus*. Observe ὡς ἀγαπῶν. In *Diognet.* i. we find ὑπερῆσπουδακότα. The word is a rare one. Comp. also Clement's ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις at the close of § 7, given above on p. 108.

It must be observed that we have not hunted far and near for these coincidences with Clement. We recognised Clement's ἀγαθὴ γνώμη as belonging to a sentence partly used in *Diognet.* vii., and then turned to passages parallel to *Diognet.* vii. which were already in our possession. Two of these passages are definitely referred to in the article on *Diognetus* in the *Church Quarterly*, April 1877. Hippolytus' *Contr. Noet.*, we may observe, which we were using a little while ago, is also there quoted several times.

The subject of *Diognetus* in the passage given above is "free-will." Clement's subject is "repentance." There is, of course, a connection between the two, but Clement does not point it out. The reason why the writer of *Diognetus* combines the several parallels pointed out above is obvious. It is not so evident why the writer of Clement's epistle uses the selfsame passages. We want something plainly to connect Clement's subject with that of *Diognetus*. This missing link we can supply.

In John Dam. *Sacr. Par.* lit. A., tit. ix. (*de arbitrii libertate*), p. 315, the passage just now quoted from *Quis div. salv.* is found, and almost directly afterwards an extract from Eusebius, which contains the following words: τὸ κέρδος καὶ τὴν ζημίαν λέγει διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαΐου· Ἐὰν θέλητε, καὶ εἰσακούσητέ μου, τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς φάγεσθε· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε, μηδὲ εἰσακούσητέ μου, ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναγκάζω. This is the LXX. version of Isa. i. 19, 20, with the exception of the last three words, which differ widely from the LXX. Clement quotes them, and quotes them correctly in (obs.) § 8 (*vid. sup.* p. 109).

In the passage from Clem. Alex. *Quis div. salv.*, which is given in the *Sacr. Par.* just above the extract from Eusebius, are the words οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκάζει ὁ Θεός.

The case then stands thus: There are four passages (one from Irenæus, one from Hippolytus, and two from Clement of Alexandria) which have one leading idea in common, and all of which appear to be used both by the author of *Diognetus* and the writer of Clement's *Ep.* i. One of these parallel passages is here in the *Sacr. Par.*, and along with it, in a quota-

tion from Eusebius, a version of Isa. i. 19, 20, so altered from the LXX. as to embody the leading idea of these passages in the language of that particular passage which stands alongside of it. Those very verses are quoted by the writer of Clement's epistle in the place where he seems to use the four passages referred to. Is it not natural to infer that this writer had the *Sacra Parallela* of John of Damascus before him? We wanted the link of connection between the main subject of Clement's *Ep.* i. 7, 8, and the main subject of *Diognet.* vii., which the *seeming* use of the same passages by both writers led us to expect. We have now found this connecting link. Shall we be content to set this down to "accident," together with the train of coincidences which led to its discovery, and which it supports? or shall we call to mind that we have already, in c. iii. p. 25, remarked a coincidence of a very similar character between the *Florilegium* of Stobæus and Clem. *Ep.* i. 37?

It will not be denied that Eusebius has laid a very bold hand on the words of Holy Scripture, nor yet that it is a remarkable circumstance that the wording of this bold innovation should so closely resemble the language of Clem. Alex. which is found close by. Who is this Eusebius? If he is a writer of credit, and the passage quoted is now to be found in his genuine writings, we must needs think this to be an accidental coincidence. He is a writer, however, of whom nothing is known. He is quoted more than twenty times in the *Sacr. Par.*, and is occasionally called "bishop of Alexandria." Lequien (*Sacr. Par.* p. 666) writes: "Diu multumque quæsivi quis tandem Eusebius iste fuerit, cujus operum frequentia passim in Parallelis nostris occurrunt excerpta. . . . aliunde autem in Alexandrinorum pontificum catalogis nullus Eusebius reperitur." We may then hold any opinion we please concerning this Eusebius. There is nothing in the history of the MSS. of the *Sacr. Par.* to hinder us from believing the extract from Eusebius now before us to be an interpolation, or at least to have been altered at the particular point at which we have touched it, so as to support certain theological views. Curiously enough, the very words of Irenæus (βία Θεῶν οὐ πρόσσεπιν) which have been taken over by the writer of *Diognetus*, are set down to Eusebius in *Sacr. Par.*, lit. B. tit. vii. p. 393. This fact gives some support to the idea that the extract with which

we are concerned is an interpolation, or else has been tampered with. We shall come across Eusebius again, and we shall then learn a good deal more about him.

The examination of the *Sacr. Par.* of John of Damascus, under the "title" *de arbitrii libertate* (the subject of *Diognet.* vii.), brought such curious facts to light that it may be well to examine lit. M. tit. iii. *de Pœnitentia* (Clement's subject in §§ 7, 8).

We find, as we might expect, that Clement's quotation, Isa. i. 16–20, is given. The version follows the LXX., except that it interpolates *καί* with Clement, and reads, as Clement also does, *διαλεχθῶμεν* instead of the *διελεγχθῶμεν* of the LXX. It does not read *χῆρα* as Clement does; for this divergence from the LXX. we must have recourse to the genuine Eusebius (Isa. i. 18). (*Vid. sup.* p. 109.)

Zech. i. 3 precedes Isa. i. 16–20 in the *Sacr. Par.*, and Joel ii. 12, 13 precedes Zech. i. 3. The verses from Joel begin with *ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.* Comp. with Clement's apocryphal quotation in § 8 (*vid. sup.* p. 108). It is a small matter, no doubt, but we may take note of the *πρὸς με* of Joel.

Following Isa. i. 16–20 is Isa. xix. 22, and then the words *ὅταν ἐπιστραφῇς στενάξεις, τότε σωθήσῃ*, in silence as to the source from which they are taken. Following these words is Isa. xliii. 25, and then xlv. 21, and 22 *ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς με, καὶ σωθήσεσθε οἱ ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς*. Comp. Clement's *ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς* in the apocryphal quotation in § 8.

The *Sacr. Par.* give a number of other passages of Holy Scripture, and also extracts—some of them very long ones—from various writers. On p. 594 an extract is given from Clem. Alex. *Quis div. salv.* 39. It is so given, however, as to show that some words of Clem. Alex. are omitted. It is worth our while to see what the omitted words are. Examination shows that 19 lines are omitted, and that they contain this noticeable passage :

διὸ καὶ κέκραγεν ἔλεον θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν. οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀμαρτωλοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν. καὶ ὅσιν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν ἔριον, ὡς χίονα λευκανῶ· καὶ¹ μελάντερον τοῦ σκότους, ὡς ἔριον λευκὸν ἐκνίψας ποιήσω.

¹ In *Theoph.* vi. p. 632 is the curious expression *ἀντὶ φωτὸς μελανεμβαφῆς σκότες*. The story justifies the expression. A person having reviled the image

This passage is quoted by the editors in illustration of our Clement's apocryphal quotation in § 8, and some of them (at any rate) suppose that the two Clements were indebted to an apocryphal or interpolated book of Ezekiel, for a reason which will appear directly. Now, it is obvious to ask which of the two Clements gives the original words of this book of Ezekiel. If it is answered that Clem. Alex. gives them, it has then to be explained why our Clement so strangely alters them. If, on the other hand, our Clement is supposed to give the original, it has to be explained why he gives this curious version of Isa. i. 18, and then immediately follows it by another, which, though not free from divergences which can be found in Eusebius and the *Sacr. Par.*, is still very nearly that of the LXX. For Clement *does* in the seeming apocryphal quotation give a version of Isa. i. 18 (καὶ ἐὰν ᾧσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ· ἐὰν δὲ ᾧσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς ἔριον λευκανῶ), as is evident from two considerations. In the first place, on the hypothesis, Clem. Alex. had before him the words now given by our Clement, and he has altered them into a more approved version of Isa. i. 18. Compare. In the next place, because our Clement's citation too closely resembles existing versions of Isa. i. 18 to be anything else than itself a version. Compare the words just given from Isa. i. 18 with Clement's apocryphal quotation. Both of the versions are cast in the same mould. Clement's first five words are in the first clause of the LXX. version. Symmachus' version of the second clause runs: ἐὰν δὲ πύργαι ᾧσιν ὡς κόκκινον. Clement must then give us a version of Isa. i. 18 in his so-called apocryphal quotation. We have found in Symmachus one of his divergences. Let us look at the rest. In Isa. i. 6, ἀπὸ ποδῶν ἕως κεφαλῆς, we have the form of his first divergence. We have just found, however, close by Isa. i. 16–20 in the *Sacr. Par.*, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. It is very easy to trace the history of his ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The *μελάντερον* of Clem. Alex. in the passage just given shows that he contemplates sins greater even than those to which Isa. i. 18, which he cites, refers. The prophet has in his mind the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah. Clem. Alex. contemplates, therefore, sins greater than those of Sodom. We are irresistibly

of the Saviour, a dove was seen to go out from his mouth, and the Evil One to enter in the form of a crow!

reminded of our Lord's words, καὶ σὺ, Καπερναοῦμ, ἡ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἕως ἁδου καταβιβασθῇσθ. ὅτι εἰ ἐν Σοδόμοις κ.τ.λ. S. Matt. xi. 23. Clement's divergence here is tantamount to a comparative to correspond to his following πυρρότεραι and μελανώτεραι. As Stephens would say, Clement "looks at" the "celebrem historiam" (*vid. sup.* p. 16) of Capernaum. But in ver. 21 our Lord says, "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in σάκκῳ and ashes." This explains the alteration of the σκότους of Clem. Alex. into our Clement's σάκκου, and suggests that thereby he is looking at another "celebrem historiam."

Clem. Alex., in the passage just given, with Isa. i. 18 combines S. Matt. ix. 13 (which does not concern us) and Ezek. xxxiii. 11, 12 ζῶ ἐγώ, τάδε λέγει Κύριος, οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς ὥς (obs.)—[Clement's προστιθεὶς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθὴν]—καὶ ἵνατί ἀποθνήσκετε οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ; εἶπον πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ λαοῦ σου . . . ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ἀποστρέψῃ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Let our readers now turn to p. 108, and compare this with § 8. Can anything be plainer than that the writer of Clement's epistle availed himself of the reference to Ezek. xxxiii. 11, which the words of Clem. Alex. supplied, and then, making some alterations partly in accordance with the language of Clem. Alex., inserted his notable expression προστιθεὶς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθὴν into the middle of verses 11, 12? This is exactly in accordance with everything else which has been observed.

We return now to the *Sacr. Par.* Immediately above the extract from *Quis div. salv.* 39, there is another from Clement of Alexandria. It is taken from *Pædag.* i. 9, p. 146. Now, it happens that on p. 151 is the second passage quoted by the editors in illustration of our Clement's citations: φησὶ γὰρ διὰ Ἰεζεκιήλ. Ἐὰν ἐπιστραφῇτε ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπητε, Πάτερ, ἀκούσομαι ὑμῶν ὥς λαοῦ ἁγίου. These words are very nearly those of our Clement in § 8. The mention of the prophet's name by Clem. Alex. has led to the supposition that the citation in § 8 is taken from an apocryphal or interpolated book of Ezekiel. The theory is, however, only required to bolster up the credit of our Clement's *Ep.* 1. Clem. Alex. is

not necessarily here using any apocryphal writing. As Potter says: "Prophetæ sensum, mutatis verbis, exhibet." Clem. Alex. treats the gospels and the psalms of David in this same place in precisely the same way as he does the Prophet Ezekiel. The sentence, moreover, next preceding that just now given from *Quis div. salv.* is a short summary of S. Luke xv., and it is introduced with *φησί*. The words now found in *Pædag.* i. 10 cannot be independent of our Clement's. Is it not reasonable to conclude that the writer of the epistle observed the language of Clem. Alex., and that he was led to associate them with Isa. i. 18 through the intervention of the *Sacr. Par.*, which give, as we have seen, some words of the prophet Joel, which are the same as those used by the two Clements. It will be understood now why we called attention to the *πρός με* of Joel and Clement, but which Clem. Alex. has not.

Very little now remains of Clement's §§ 7, 8 unaccounted for. Almost the only question, indeed, that can be asked about them is this: Whence does the writer get his idea that God spake concerning repentance with an oath? We can find this.

Tertullian, *de Pœnitentia* (obs.) iv., writes thus: "At enim ille non præcipit tantum; sed etiam hortatur. Invitat (Ezech. xxxiii. 11) præmio salutem, JURANS, etiam vivo dicens, cupit credi sibi. O beatos nos quorum caussa Deus jurat!" We consulted this treatise because we had previously (p. 37) seen reason for thinking that Tertullian was used by the author of *Peregrinus*.

3. Though the language of Clement's §§ 7, 8, and the apocryphal citations which the latter contains, have been sufficiently discussed, we must nevertheless return to the *Sacr. Par.* and to the extracts given under the title *de Pœnitentia*.

(1.) On. p. 587, a long extract from Chrys. *Hom.* ii. in Ps. l. begins. The extract next in order (p. 590) is also from Chrysostom; but it is not stated from what particular writing it is taken. We, Chrysostom says (in substance) in this last extract, *οἱ τῶν θυσιαστηρίῳ παρεδρεύοντες*, and whose business it is to teach, are compassed with sin and infirmity. We trust, however, to the loving-kindness of God, and do not refuse the responsibilities to which we are called, though we are only

sinful men. If you sin, he says, you do not incur such great guilt as we do, for you are under teachers : ἡμεῖς δὲ ὅσα πολλῶ τῷ ἁξιώματι ὑπερέχομεν, τοσούτῳ πολλῶ καὶ τῷ ἐγκλήματι ὑποκείμεθα. Comp. Clement's οἱ οὖν παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον τῆς βουλήσεως αὐτοῦ ποιοῦντές τι θάνατον τὸ πρόστιμον ἔχουσιν. Ὁρᾶτε, ἀδελφοί, ὅσα πλείονος κατηξιώθημεν γνώσεως, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὑποκείμεθα κινδύνῳ. § 41. These words have been already quoted on p. 119. Here again the parallel is a good one. Now, it happens that if we take up Chrysostom's *Hom.* ii. in *Ps.* l., where the extract given in the *Sacr. Par.* leaves off, we come presently to εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι μὴ ἤμαρτον, οὐκ ἂν ἐδέξαντο τοῦ θανάτου τὸ ἐπιτίμιον. Comp. with Clement's words just given. Further on, in the same *Homily*, Chrysostom quotes vv. 18, 19, "Do good in Thy good pleasure unto Zion ; build Thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offering, and whole burnt offering ; then shall they offer bullocks upon Thine altar (ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριόν σου)." The psalm, Chrysostom remarks, is full of prophecy, and suited to the case of those Jews who were compelled to dwell in Babylon, ἰκετεύουσι γὰρ οἴκτου τινὸς ἄξιωθῆναι τὴν πόλιν, τῶν περιβόλων ἀνορθουμένων, τῆς κατὰ νόμον τελουμένης λατρείας· νῦν μὲν γὰρ, Φησί, τὴν ἀλλοτρίαν οἰκοῦντας τὰς ἁρισμένας θυσίας προσφέρειν οὐκ ἔνεστιν, ἐν ἐκείνῃ μόνῃ τῇ πόλει θύειν σοι τοῦ νόμου διαγορεύοντος. But Clement in this same § 41 bids the Corinthians not to transgress τὸν ἁρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα. He goes on : οὐ πανταχοῦ προσφέρονται θυσίαι . . . ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ· καὶ κεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ' ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον. Obs. the "Jerusalem," and ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον of the psalm. The use of Heb. x. in Clement's § 41 has been pointed out on p. 119. It would certainly appear that the writer was indebted also to the *Sacr. Par.* and Chrysostom's *Homily*.

(2.) If we look onward in the *Sacr. Par.*, but still under the same "title," our attention is arrested by the following words : καλὸν καὶ Ἰούδα τῷ παραδεδακότι με, εἰ μετανόησεν, καὶ μὴ ἀπήγξατο. τῶν γὰρ μετανοούντων¹ εἰμὶ Θεός. διὰ τοῦτο κατήλθον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἵνα μετάνοιαν τῷ κόσμῳ χαρίσωμαι. Above, in an extract from the same writer, we remark διὰ

¹ From the *Orat. Manass.*, *vid. sup.* p. 120.

τοῦτο κατῆλθον ἵνα ἀντεισαγάγω¹ ὑμῖν χάριν. Comp. the καλὸν καὶ . . . παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ἐπήνεγκε of Clement's § 7, quoted on p. 108. This coincidence with Clement is very interesting, because it is found in an extract from the writings of the mysterious Eusebius (*vid. sup.* p. 135).

These extracts begin with some lines which, in *Sacr. Par.* p. 343, are ascribed to Philo: ὅταν ἄνθρωπος κατορθώσῃ βίον ἐν ἀρετῶν δι' ἀσκήσεως . . . ὅτι ἐστὶν εὐσεβής. Comp.² εἰς ἐν ἀρετῶν βίον τοῖς θέλουσιν εὐσεβῶς καὶ δικαίως διευθύνειν. Clem. *Ep.* i. 62. The Greek ms. is defective at this point. Light-

¹ Not a common word. Comp. κόραξ ἀντισάγεται, *Ep. ad Theoph.* vi. See note on p. 136.

² With both passages comp. κατορθοῦντας γὰρ τὸν κατ' ἀρετὴν βίον καὶ θεοσιβῶς διάγοντας, δίκαιον (obs.) τῶν οἰκείων ἀπολαύειν καρπῶν. Euseb. *Cær. in Isa.* lxii. 6-8. It has been pointed out on p. 124 that στέφανον κάλλους used in *Ep. ad Theoph.* xxxi. is taken from Isa. lxii. 3 καὶ ἔσῃ στέφανος κάλλους ἐν χειρὶ Κυρίου, καὶ διαδήμα βασιλείας ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ σου. Eusebius explains the verse thus: στέφανος γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς (obs.) Χριστοῦ πάντες οἱ δι' αὐτοῦ κατορθοῦντες τυγχάνουσιν, καὶ διαδήμα βασιλείας εἰσὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ οἱ τοῖς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἐνηλθόντες ἀγῶσιν, οἱ ἄγιοι μάρτυρες, οὓς τῇ ἑαυτοῦ χειρὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐκλεξάμενος (obs.) τῷ Υἱῷ περιτίθῃσι, στεφανῶν αὐτὸν καὶ διαδήματι βασιλικῷ τιμῶν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ σεσωσμένων. Comp. συνεχάρην ὑμῖν μεγάλως ἐν Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν 'I. X., διζήμενοις (obs.) τὰ μιμήματα τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἀγάπης, καὶ προπέμψασιν, ὡς ἐπέβαλεν ὑμῖν, τοὺς ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ τοῖς ἀγιοπρεπέσι (obs.) δεσμοῖς, ἀτινά ἐστι διαδήματα τῶν ἀληθῶς (obs.) ὑπὸ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐκλελεγμένων (obs.). Polyc. *Phil.* i. On vv. 4, 5, Eusebius has εἶτα καὶ πρὸς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ποιῶνται τοὺς λόγους (obs.) . . . καθήκετο γὰρ ἐξ οὐρανῶν ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, 'ὃν' ἔγκαρπον ἀποφῆναι τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. . . . Δεξαμένη (obs.) τοῖνυν παρ' αὐτοῦ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς πολιτείας τὰ σπέρματα, πνευματικαῖς θυαίαις καὶ ἀγιοπρεπέσι (obs.) κατορθώμασι τὴν νόμφν ἐκλάμπουσιν ἀπέδειξεν. Polycarp proceeds: καὶ ὅτι ἡ βεβαία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν ρίζα, ἐξ ἀρχαίων καταγγελλομένη χρόνων, μέχρι νῦν διαμένει καὶ καρποφορεῖ εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν 'I. X., ὃς ὑπέμεινε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ὥς θανάτου καταπαθεῖν . . . εἰς ὃν . . . πιστεύετε . . . εἰς ἣν πολλοὶ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν εἰσελθεῖν. On ver. 10 Eusebius has εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰσέναι; and on vv. 11, 12, ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν Σωτὴρ δι' ὃν ἔπραξε καὶ πέπονθεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σωτηρίαν τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύουσιν προξενῶν.

This interesting literary entanglement, which cannot possibly be accidental, is made more interesting from the circumstance that Clement has τοῖς ἀγιοπρεπέσι λόγους (obs.) in § 13, and that Polycarp is supposed to have copied from Clement at that very point. Suicer notices ἀγιοπρεπής. He does not, of course (*vid. sup.* p. 125), refer to Clement; he gives, indeed, no earlier authority than Cyril of Alexandria. Eusebius' *Commentaria in Isaiam* were first printed in 1706.

Eusebius, we may observe, speaks of the Church as ἁγίαν καὶ ἄμωμον . . . ἀγιοπρεπέσι κατορθώμασι τὴν νόμφν ἐκλάμπουσιν. If we turn to the *Ep. ad Theoph.* xxx., where στέφανον κάλλους is found, and from which so much has been already produced on p. 118 sq., we find πρὸς . . . βεβαίωσιν τῆς . . . πίστεως, καθὼς καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἄνωθεν μέχρι τῆς δεῦρο (so far cf. with Polycarp) ἡ καθαρὰ καὶ ἄμωμος Χριστιανικὴ τέχνη εὐσεβεία . . . ἐσοπρεπῶς . . . Κυρίῳ ἢ (i. e.) τῶν . . . εἰκότων εὐκοσμία διαλάμπει.

foot says that the Syriac translator "must have had a text which a corrector had emended by striking out or altering εἰς, so as to govern βίον by διευθύνειν."

We shall not discuss the real authorship of the words in question. They may belong to Philo or to Eusebius; it matters not which of these two authors is their rightful owner. We remark, however, that we have seen very much the same thing with regard to the sentence which the *Sacr. Par.* ascribe both to Irenæus and Eusebius.

We have already found (*vid. sup.* p. 134) an extract from Eusebius in which a text of Scripture is altered in the very words of an extract from Clem. Alex., which stands close by. A very slight examination will suffice to prove that the extracts now before us are a barefaced manufacture, in part out of extracts from Basil and Chrysostom, which are found in the *Sacr. Par.* under the title *De Pœnitentia*, under which they are themselves found.

We shall take first of all about twenty lines of Basil, and compare them with as many lines of Eusebius. It must be observed, however, that the twenty lines of Basil are in three extracts from three different writings. The second of these extracts contains five lines, and the third four lines. The first is longer, but we take only the latter part of it. Basil has *μὴ ὥς εἰς βάθος κακῶν ἐμπεσῶν . . . ὅτε γὰρ ἀποστραφεῖς στενάξεις . . . τότε σωθήσῃ* (in *Ep.* xliv., from which the extract is made, *ὅταν γὰρ ἐπιστραφεῖς στενάξης, τότε σωθήσῃ*) . . . *οὐκ ἔστι νόμος δικάζων . . . ἀλλὰ χάρις πολιτευομένη, ἀναβαλλομένη τὴν κόλασιν* (Basil has *χάρις ὑπεριθεμένη τὴν κόλασιν*; note the change). The first extract ends with *οὐ κυριεύει ἡ ἁμαρτία*. The second extract has *μὴ τῷ βάθει τῶν κακῶν ἐναπομείνης . . . οἷδε γὰρ ἀνορθοῦν κατερράγμένους ὁ Κύριος*. The third extract begins with *μηδεὶς ἐν κακίᾳ διάγων ἑαυτὸν ἀπογνωσκέτω*. Comp. *ἵνα μὴ ἀπογινώσκη αὐτοῦ, καὶ παντελῶς ἐκπέσῃ εἰς τὸν βυθὸν τῆς ἀπωλείας . . . Καὶ μὴ κατακυριευθῇ ὑπὸ τῶν πονηρῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπινοιῶν . . . ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τῷ παραπτώματι μείνῃ . . . ἐὰν ἐπιστραφεῖς στενάξης τότε σωθήσῃ . . . μὴ ἀπογινώσκει ἑαυτοῦ . . . ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμι ὁ ἀνορθῶν τοὺς κατερράγμένους. ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν (obs.) τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος,—St. Matt. xi. 28,—ἐγὼ τὸ φορτίον ὑμῶν κουφίζω. οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε βαστάσαι τὸ τοῦ νόμου φορτίον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κατῆλθον, ἵνα ἀντισταγὰγῶ ὑμῖν χάριν, ἵνα*

τὸ φορτίον τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν κουφίσω. It is impossible that these things can be accidental.

The words last given are the property of S. Chrysostom, for in an extract on p. 588, still under the same "title," *de Pœnitentia*, we find ἤκουσας (obs.) τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος. Κύριος κ.τ.λ. . . . φορτία ἔχεις πλημμελημάτων θέλω αὐτὰ κουφίσαι. Eusebius goes on to say μηδεὶς παραιτήσεται, εἴτε μάγος, εἴτε τελώνης, εἴτε βλάσφημος, προσελθεῖν τῇ μετανοίᾳ. μηδεὶς φοβηθῇ. Chrysostom, in like manner, after two lines, speaks of the "thief," then of the "tax-gatherer." If we look at the preceding page, we find μηδεὶς . . . ἀπογινώσκη τῆς ἐαυτοῦ σωτηρίας, ἀσεβῆς εἰ; ἐννόησον τοὺς μάγους, and in like manner in the next line τὸν τελώνην, and in the next τὴν πόρνην, and in the next τὸν ληστήν, and in the next τὸν βλάσφημον. Eusebius has ἡ πόρνη φιλήσασα . . . τὸ χειρόγραφον τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν διέρρηξεν . . . ὃ γυναικὸς φιλοσοφία! and Chrysostom, on p. 596, ὅρα τὸν Ἰωσήφ, πῶς φιλοσοφίαν πολλὴν ἐπέδειξατο . . . τὸν μὲν χιτῶνα σχίσας τὴν πίστιν οὐ διαρρήξας.

The second extract is of the same character as the first, and partly indebted to the same sources. It is an imaginary message to Simon Peter, in explanation of the words "and Peter" in S. Mark xvi. 7: "But go your way, tell His disciples and Peter," etc. You see, the writer says, the pity of τοῦ Δεσπότου; He uttered no other name but that of Peter only. Why? because the others did not say: "Though we should die with Thee, yet will we not deny Thee" (S. Matt. xxvi. 35, where it is added, "Likewise also said all the disciples!"): Οὗτος (obs.) δὲ εἰρηκῶς ἠρνήσατό με· καὶ ἐξελθὼν (obs.) ἔξω ἔκλαυσε πικρῶς. μέλλει (obs.) οὖν φοβεῖσθαι to come into my presence. Tell Peter not to fear: . . . οὐκ ἔδωκα ἄλλω τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν. μὴ δειλιάσῃς· οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκας (obs.)¹ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. μὴ φοβηθῇς, Πέτρε· οὐ μετέστησά σε τοῦ θρόνου (obs.) μου· οὐκ ἡλάττωσά² σε τῆς χάριτός μου. ὃ (obs.) γὰρ ἐπηγγειλάμην

¹ Is this a real or assumed corruption of the text? Cf. ἰπιστεύθη of Chrysostom, which follows presently.

² Eusebius has this clause again, adding ὅτι καὶ σκιά σου ἰᾶσθαι ἔχει τοὺς ἀσθενέας, καὶ σουδάρια, καὶ σιμικίνθια φυγαδεύει τοὺς δαίμονας, καὶ ἡ ἀφ᾽ ἧς χειρὸς σου κ.τ.λ. This is very like other treatments of χάρις which have been observed.

(obs.), πληρώσω. ἐπὶ τῇ πεπετραμένῃ (obs.) σου πίστει I will build my Church: . . . εἰδὼν σου τὰ δάκρυα, καὶ ἀφῆκά σοι τὸ ἁμάρτημα. τῷ Δαβὶδ δύο κακὰ ἐργασαμένῳ, μοιχείαν καὶ φόνον, συνεχώρησα, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν τάξιν τῆς προφητείας ἀνήγαγον. . . . ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ κ.τ.λ. (bis).

We have already seen in the extract from Chrysostom, which supplied us with a parallel for the close of Clement's § 41, that Chrysostom speaks of himself and his brethren in the ministry as compassed with sin and infirmity. He tells us that the ministry of the gospel has been entrusted to sinful men, for the express purpose that they may be themselves compassionate towards sinners. He goes on (p. 591) to adduce the Apostle Peter as an example: Πέτρος ἤμελλεν (obs.) πιστεῦεσθαι τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐπιστεύθη¹ (obs.) τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ἤμελλεν (obs.) πιστεῦεσθαι τὸ πλῆθος τῶν λαῶν. τί γάρ φησιν ὁ Δεσπότης (obs.) πρὸς αὐτόν. "Ὁ ἐὰν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κ.τ.λ.,—that Peter who said to Christ, "Though I should die with Thee," etc., οὗτος ἐλθὼν . . . denied Him. ὦ Πέτρε, Chrysostom exclaims, τοὔτό ἐστιν ὅλον ὃ (obs.) ἐπηγγείλω (obs.); . . . Christ looked upon him, and as soon as Peter understood His meaning, he began to weep and to repent. He fell into sin, that, knowing his own sin, καὶ τὸ τοῦ Δεσπότου (obs.) συγχώρημα, he might himself forgive. Why have I said this? because we who are priests, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου (obs.) καθεζόμενοι, are prone to sin.

We now turn to *Hom. ii. in Ps. l.*, from which large extracts are given in the *Sacr. Par.*, and which just now

Notice also the alteration by Eusebius of Basil's χάρις ὑπερτιθεμένη into χάρις πολιτευομένη, and the coincidence, pointed out above, with Clement's μετανοίας χάρις.

¹ Chrysostom's remark forces us to the conclusion that Eusebius' οὐ ἔδῃσας has been deliberately written. No doubt the alteration in the text was intended to look like the carelessness of "the ignorant scribe." At any rate, before this plea can be accepted as the explanation of the appropriate coincidence with Chrysostom, it must be proved that the extracts from Eusebius are "above suspicion." We seem to have here an indication, that while Clement's κλεῖς in § 43 (*vid. sup.* p. 56) is a joke upon "the keys" of S. Peter, his ἔδῃσεν jestingly refers to the power of "binding and loosing" (*vid. sup.* p. 118 ὁ λαϊκὸς . . . δίδεται). It has been already shown that Eusebius uses here the *Orat. Manass.*, so does Clement in that remarkable section. Turning as we naturally do to *Cat. vi. 15*, we find that Cyril says, "the pair of good apostles" διορθοῦνται τὸ πταῖσμα. This is followed presently by βυθῷ τῆς κακίας. Eusebius has, as we have seen, εἰς τὸν βυθὸν τῆς ἀπωλείας, and it is followed by διορθοῦμαί σου τὸ σφάλμα.

supplied us with very noticeable parallels also for Clement's § 41.

On p. 867 (*Wust.*, Francof. 1698), Chrysostom has ἄκουε τί φησι τῷ Πέτρῳ, τῷ στυλῳ, τῇ κρηπιδι, τῷ διὰ τοῦτο κληθέντι Πέτρῳ, ἐπειδὴ τῇ πίστει (obs.) πεπετρωμένος (obs.) ἦν. Σίμων, Σίμων κ.τ.λ., and presently ἐγὼ εἰμι and ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ several times. A few lines above he has ὡς ἔξει τέλος ἡ προφητεία· ἀλλὰ μηδεὶς ἀμφιβαλλέτω, εἰ κατὰ τὸν τῆς μετανοίας καιρὸν, προφητικῆς ἡξίατο χάριτος ὁ μέγας Δαβίδ. . . ὡς οὐκ ἐστέρητο τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος χάριτος. . . διπλὴν γὰρ ἔχει τοῦ νόμου παρά- βασιν. . . καὶ Κύριος ἀφείλε τὸ ἀμάρτημά σου. Previously Chrysostom has said ἰδοὺ δύο ἀμαρτήματα, μοιχείαι καὶ φόνος, and presently, in the middle of a few lines, which tell of David's sin and repentance, but which are omitted from the extract from this *Homily* given in the *Sacr. Par.*, he has ἐποίησε μὲν οὖν φόνον καὶ μοιχείαν· παρέσχε δὲ δάκρυα.

Nothing can well be plainer than that these extracts, under the name of Eusebius, are manufactured, and that they are partly made up out of materials found ready to the writer's hand, under the very "title," in the *Sacr. Par.*, where his own composition is found. These so-called extracts can be nothing else than interpolations of the *Sacra Parallela* of John of Damascus. What has been already observed (*vid. sup.* p. 135) with respect to another extract looks entirely in the same direction. A good deal more evidence on this point might be produced if it were necessary. We shall content ourselves, however, with very briefly noticing two other so-called extracts from Eusebius, which offer some features of special interest.

In *Sacr. Par.* lit. II. tit. xxvii. p. 665, an extract from Eusebius is found containing the following words: ὁ διάβολος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς βάσκανός ἐστι καὶ πολέμιος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. ἐὰν ἴδῃ ἔργον καλὸν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, φθονεῖ, καὶ ἀγωνίζεται καταργῆσαι αὐτό. Comp. ἀλλὰ γε ὁ πολέμιος καὶ ἀρχαῖος τοῦ γένους ἐπί- βουλος διάβολος, φθὼν καὶ βασκανία τῶν καλῶν τετηκώς κ.τ.λ. *Ep. ad Theoph.* vii. p. 632, in the middle, that is, of the passage of which so much use has been made on p. 121 (*vid. infr.* p. 150).

In *Sacr. Par.* lit. II. tit. xxxi. p. 671, in another extract from Eusebius, the writer has καὶ πάντες ὡς ὑπόπτεροι τρέ- χουσιν τὰ θεάματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁρῶμεν. . . ὅλα βασιλείας

πρόξενα ταῦτα ἀκούει ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. τί δὲ θεωρεῖ ὁ τρέχων εἰς τὰ θέατρα; ἄσματα διαβολικά. Returning now to the *Sacr. Par.* under *De Pœnitentia*, and to an extract from Chrysostom's *Hom. i. in Ps. l. p. 584*, we find ὁ τῆς ἄνωθεν ἀπολαύσας ῥοπῆς . . . εἶδεν, ἐπτερώθη τὸ ὄμμα . . . σὺ δὲ ἐν θεάτρῳ βλέπεις, ὅπου καὶ ὁ τρόπος κολάζει ψυχὴν οὐ βλέπεις δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκούεις ῥημάτων κακίας, καὶ βλέπεις στολὴν πορνικὴν καὶ ἄσματα διαβολικὰ πανταχόθεν. . . ἄνθρωπος εἶ, τὴν κοινὴν τῆς φύσεως ἀσθένειαν περικείμενος. Comp., further, with the extract from Eusebius βασιλείας οὐρανῶν προξενούσα; and with that from Chrysostom καὶ εἰ μὲν καλῶς . . . τοῦτο τῆς ἄνωθεν ὑπάρχει ῥοπῆς. εἰ δὲ βαναύσως . . . τοῦτο τὸ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀσθενείας. The first of these coincidences is found in the first *Preface* to the *Sacra Parallela*, while the second *Preface* supplies the coincidences with Chrysostom.

§ 7. The two *Prefaces* to the *Sacra Parallela* of John of Damascus, of which the first is much the shortest, occupy only about two columns of Migne's edition. Each of them is careful to inform us that the opinions of Philo and Josephus will be found in the pages of the *Sacr. Par.*, apparently for the sake of calling special attention to this fact; the two *Prefaces* here, but not elsewhere, adopt the same language. It is as if the writer (or writers) thought that some apology for the presence of extracts from Philo and Josephus¹ in the *Sacr. Par.* was needed. The argument to be read between the lines may perhaps be somewhat as follows: there are two *Prefaces*; one or other of them at least must be from the pen of John of Damascus; this sentence is in both *Prefaces*, it must necessarily therefore be the Damascene's own declaration. Critics have nevertheless been somewhat sceptical on this point.

¹ Under the name of Josephus a considerable excerpt from a treatise commonly ascribed to Hippolytus is given at the very end of the *Sacr. Par.* Lightfoot (p. 470) points out a number of resemblances between this treatise (and that part of it which stands in the *Sacr. Par.* under the name of Josephus) and Clement's *Ep. ii.*, and says that they "suggest that our Clementine Homily (Clem. *Ep. ii.*) was known to this writer." Curiously enough, some of these resemblances are to the language of § 19, the very section, that is, which contains, as we shall see directly, coincidences with the *Prefaces* to the *Sacr. Par.* Have the *Sacr. Par.* here, as in the case of the extracts from Eusebius, been interpolated? and have the *Prefaces* to the *Sacr. Par.* been tampered with in order to support the interpolation?

It may be well to hear what Lequien, the editor of the *Sacr. Par.*, has to say upon our *Prefaces*. He writes, p. 277 :—

In codicibus tam Vaticano, quam Venetiano Græcorum, præfationes duæ toti operi præmittuntur, quarum prior nonnihil mihi difficultatis suggestit. Huic Jacobus Billius Latinum hunc titulum fecit: *Præfatio Græci cujusdam in D. Joannis Damasceni Parallela*. Dum vero singula membra, imo singulas voces oculis et mente pensito, nihil me reperire fateor, quod non a Parallelorum auctore scriptam significet, præter hæc postrema verba, *ὅκ ἐλαττοῦντα τοῦτων τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ῥηθησόμενα λόγια*, nec doctorum eloquia quæ eruditus Pater est producturus, infirmant. Cæterum Venetianus codex ista non habet; Billius vero in *Sermones a Spiritu sancto pronuntiatos* ea transtulit; at legerit, *Παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος*, non *παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς*, a *Patre*, seu Parallelorum collectore. Atqui hæc postrema lectio, quam velut verissimam teneo, cum Præfationis hujus prioris alium a Damasceno auctorem indicat, tum Joannem nostrum symbolas et excerpta Philonis et Josephi in sua *Parallela* non conguessisse, sed ab isto anonymo postmodum adjecta esse: ut proinde quæ ad calcem alterius præfationis de iisdem excerptis leguntur, ex hac prima mutuata transumptaque fuerint a librariis quibusdam, qui, ea prætermittenda, alteram duntaxat, quæ genuina Joannis Damasceni est, *Parallelis* ipsis præfigendam censuerint.

To speak plainly, the first preface is, in the judgment of Lequien, a fraudulent attempt to make an interpolated document pass muster as the *Sacra Parallela* which John of Damascus compiled. If any portion of the second *Preface* were from the pen of the Damascene, it would be natural to go on to suppose that the writer of the first *Preface* added to the second that it might tell the same false story as the first. We shall show, however, that that part of the second *Preface* which Lequien supposes to be genuine was really written by the author of the first *Preface*, and that that author cannot reasonably be supposed to have been John of Damascus.

1. In the second *Preface* the author writes :—

ὃν δὲ τρόπον οἶνος ὕδατι συκραθεῖς, ἡδύς ἐστι καὶ ἐπιτερπὴν τὴν χάριν ἀποτελεῖ· οὕτως καὶ ἡ κατασκευὴ ὅλου τοῦ συγγράμματος, σύμμικτος οὖσα ἀπὸ τῆς θείας Γραφῆς, καὶ τῶν ὁσίων καὶ θεοφόρων ἀνδρῶν, πολλὰν ἔχει, τοῖς μὲν βουλομένοις ἀναγινώσκειν ψυχαγωγίαν, τοῖς δὲ φιλοπονοῦσιν, εἰς τὸ διὰ μνήμης ἀναλαβεῖν εὐμάρειαν· πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν, ὠφέλειαν. Cf. ὃν δὲ τρόπον οἶνος ὕδατι κ.τ.λ., 2 Macc. xv. 39.

Compare ὥστε, ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἀδελφαί, μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναγινώσκω ὑμῶν ἔντευξιν εἰς τὸ προσέχειν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, ἵνα καὶ

ἐαυτοὺς σώσητε καὶ τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα ἐν ὑμῖν· μισθὸν γὰρ αἰτῶ ὑμᾶς τὸ μετανοῆσαι ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σωτηρίαν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ζωὴν διδόντας. τοῦτο γὰρ ποιήσαντες σκοπὸν πᾶσιν τοῖς νέοις θήσομεν τοῖς βουλομένοις περὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν χρηστότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλοπονεῖν. Clem. Ep. ii. 19.

On μετὰ τὸν Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. Lightfoot says: “i.e. ‘After you have heard the voice of God in the Scriptures,’ as it is rightly explained by Bryennios.” This makes the parallel closer.

Compare also διόπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς τὰς περιπετείας ταύτας ἀναγραφῆς ἤξιώσαμεν, οὐ ψυχαγωγίας ἀλλ’ ὠφελείας ἕνεκα τῶν ἀγαγινωσκόντων, Phot. Bibl. 244, p. 379 (one of the so-called excerpts from Diodorus containing the infamous account of the hermaphrodites).

The one writer seems to borrow from the *Preface* what the other leaves.

Now, observe, a few lines above, in this excerpt we have ἕνος στοιχείου ἐπὶ τῇ τέλει τοῦ ν προστιθέντος, and a few lines below μετ’ ὀλίγον δὲ καὶ παρ’ Ἀθηναίους τοῦ τοιούτου γενομένου κ.τ.λ. In the *Preface* we find . . . στοιχεῖα· ἐν τέλει δὲ ἐκάστου γράμματός εἰσι τίτλοι παραπεμπόμενοι, περὶ ὧν μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐν τοῖς τόποις γενόμενος κ.τ.λ. We remark also, in the excerpt, διπλοῦν ἀπῆτει τὸν μισθόν. Comp.¹ the μισθὸν αἰτῶ of Clement, which is in some sort “double,” for he is “looking” at 1 Tim. iv. 16 “for in so doing thou shalt both save thyself and τοὺς ἀκούοντάς σου.” In the next sentence Clement has ἀγανακτῶμεν οἱ ἄσσοφοι, and Lightfoot translates: “fools that we are,” adding “for this is the force of the article; comp. § 1, οἱ ἀκούοντες.” The sentence in ii. 1 runs: καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες ὡς περὶ μικρῶν ἀμαρτάνομεν. Comp. ὁ ὑπακούων μοι οὐκ αἰσχυρθήσεται, καὶ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐχ ἀμαρτήσουσι. Ecclus. xxiv. 22. Comp. also οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν εὐπροσδεκτοὶ τε καὶ μακάριοι (obs.) τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τοῦ δεσπότητος ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ διαμαρτάνουσιν . . . προστάγμασιν. Clem. Ep. i. 40; and also μακάριοι (obs.) οἱ τούτοις ὑπακούοντες (obs.) τοῖς προστάγμασιν, Ep. ii. 19, a few lines after the passage quoted above; and further, from the first *Preface* (speaking of the opinions of Philo and Josephus), ὡς οὐ μόνον τοῦ σκοποῦ (cf. with passage from ii. 19, quoted above), τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν πιστοτάτων καὶ μακαρίων (obs.) ἀνδρῶν οὐδ’ ὅλως διαμαρτάνουσιν (obs.). When the writer of Clement’s Epistles has once got hold of an idea, he is never

¹ Also ὅτι δισσὴν ἔξουσιν τὴν κρίσιν, αὐτοὶ τε καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες, ii. 11.

weary of showing his knowledge of equivalent expressions. So is it also with the author of the first *Preface* in this question of "obedience." In the first twelve lines we find τῶν θείων ἐντολῶν τήρησις, φυλάξτε τὰς ἐντολάς, τοὺς πειθαρχοῦντας τοῖς προστάγμασιν, τὰ ἐντεταλμένα προθύμως ἐκτελεῖν.

We quoted Ecclus. xxiv. 22 just now in illustration of some words from Clem. *Ep.* ii. 1, among which were ὡς περὶ μικρῶν. It happens that ὡς is a most conspicuous word in the latter part of Ecclus. xxiv., e.g. ver. 27 ὁ ἐκφαίνων ὡς φῶς παιδεῖαν (obs. cf. Heb. xii. 7 εἰ παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε, ὡς υἱοῖς κ.τ.λ.), ὡς κ.τ.λ., which may be compared with Clement's clever adaptation: τὸ φῶς γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο, ὡς πατὴρ υἱοῦς ἡμᾶς προσηγόρευσεν κ.τ.λ. still in ii. 1. The idea of sonship is also in the first twelve lines of the first *Preface*: ὑπὲρ ἐλπίδα τὸ τῆς υἱοθεσίας ἄξίωμα, which may be further illustrated out of *Ep.* ii. 1, for we have μηδεμίαν ἐλπίδα ἔχοντας, εἰ μὴ παρ' αὐτοῦ.

Ecclus. xxv. 17 runs: πονηρία γυναικὸς ἀλλοιοῖ τὴν ὄρασιν αὐτῆς, καὶ σκοτοῖ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς ὡς σάκκον. In *Ep.* ii. 19 we have ἐσκοτίσμεθα τὴν διάνοιαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ματαιῶν. In *Ep.* ii. 1 there is a parallel passage, and there ἐν τῇ ὁράσει is found.

Now, observe, Ecclus. xxiv. 21 (we have just quoted ver. 22) is expressly cited in the *Preface*, and the writer makes use of the chapter in the same kind of way that Clement does. Thus the *Preface* begins with τῆς θεοπνεύστου Γραφῆς ἡ ἀσκησις, πλούτου δόξης καὶ ἀρχῆς, καὶ πάντων ὅσα τὸ θνητὸν ἀσπάζεται γένος, ὑπερέχει, σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐφόδια χαρίζομένη (cf. Clement's ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο just given). Comp. Ecclus. xxiv. 17 ἐγὼ ὡς ἄμπελος βλαστήσασα χάριν, καὶ τὰ ἄνθη μου καρπὸς δόξης καὶ πλούτου. Seven lines afterwards the writer quotes ver. 21. With the σωτηρ. ἡ ἐφόδ. χαρ. of the *Preface*, comp. the σωτηρίαν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ζωὴν διδόντας of Clement's ii. 19, given above.

There certainly appears to be a close connection of some kind between these *Prefaces* and Clement's Epistles. It does not seem to be a case of ordinary borrowing by one writer from another. The coincidences seem rather to point to one mind and one hand. The considerable passage quoted above from the second *Preface* is from that portion of it which Lequien considers to have been actually written by John of Damascus. If this opinion is a sound one, we must have mis-

interpreted the coincidences which have been produced. If, on the contrary, it can be shown that the *Prefaces* are fraudulent additions to the *Sacr. Par.* by a late hand, our conjecture as to the connection between them and Clement's *Ep.* ii. will be worthy of consideration.

2. It may be well, perhaps, before we proceed with our task, to set before our readers what it is we are going to do. We have two columns of Greek in hand, and we are going to show that they are mere patchwork, made up of words and scraps gathered from various authors. We have to find these words and scraps within reasonable distance of one another, and when gaps occur we must show some connecting link which may reasonably be thought to have induced the writer to pass from one part of a volume to another part, or from one author to another author. It will not do to find these coincidences for one part only of these columns, for we have to show that they are throughout written by the same hand. Now, if the two columns of these *Prefaces* are honest Greek, written partly by John of Damascus or wholly by some writer whose habitual language was Greek, and who had therefore no occasion to trouble himself about words and phrases, can any task be imagined more hopeless or more heart-breaking? It took us, of course, some considerable time to elaborate the proof which we are about to produce, but it was no trouble at all to find the pages to which we shall have occasion to refer. We simply dealt with these *Prefaces* as we dealt with pseudo-Galen's treatise when we saw reason to doubt its genuineness. We turned to pages which we knew to be elsewhere used.

We shall show the method we pursued. We do not say that we shall be accurately following upon our writer's track. His footsteps are visible enough, but we cannot always tell which of them are earliest in time.

We turn first of all to Diodorus, iv. 6 sq. pp. 252, 253. They are very remarkable pages. Our attention is at once arrested by the words *πρὸς τοὺς βασκαίνοντάς τι τῶν καλῶν*. Comp. the *βασκανία τῶν καλῶν* of *Ep. ad Theoph.* vii., quoted on p. 145.

In the next sentence Diodorus speaks of the hermaphrodite, and he uses the rather uncommon word *παρεμφερός*, in a passage which has much in common with a sentence containing

that word, and which is found in the excerpt from Diodorus in Phot. *Bibl.* 244, only a few lines below the passage given above. It was the connection between the *Prefaces* and this "excerpt" that induced us to try these pages of Diodorus.

Diodorus goes on to speak of the Muses. Authorities, he says, differ, but some few of the poets *θυγατέρας ἀποφαίνονται Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Γῆς*. They disagree also as to the number of the Muses, but the number nine prevails, *ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἀνδρῶν βεβαιούμενος*. In the first *Preface* we have *καὶ υἱοῦς Θεοῦ . . . ἀπεφῆναιτο*. Presently the writer describes the opinions of Philo and Josephus as being not at all inferior to those of the *παρ' ἡμῖν πιστοτάτων καὶ μακαρίων ἀνδρῶν*, adding *ἀλλὰ γε καὶ πολλὴν τὴν ἰσότητα, καὶ¹ ὁμοιολεξίαν ἐν τε λόγοις καὶ ἡθεσι² ἐπιδείκνυνται, βεβαιοῦντα μᾶλλον, οὐκ³ ἐλαττοῦντα τούτων παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ῥηθυσόμενα λόγια*.

Diodorus then gives the derivation of *Μοῦσα*. The excerpts from Helladius (Phot. *Bibl.* 279)—the falsity of which has been shown on p. 52—adopt (p. 531) Diodorus' opinion. Turning to the passage, we find, a few lines above it, *συνάπτουσι*, and presently *ἔστιν εὐρεῖν* and *σαφῆ παρίστησι*. In the first line of first *Preface* we have *συνάπτουσα*, and in the second *Preface* we find *ἔστιν εὐρεῖν* and *σαφῶς παριστᾶν*.

Diodorus proceeds to give a short explanation of the names of the nine Muses. Every one of these explanations is more or less perfectly represented in the second *Preface*.

1. *Clio*: so called *διὰ τὸν ἐκ τῆς ποιήσεως τῶν ἐγκωμιαζομένων ἔπαινον μέγα κλέος περιποιεῖν τοῖς ἐπαινουμένοις*. In the *Preface* we are told that the *Sacr. Par.* contain not only the words of Holy Scripture, but also of the holy fathers, *ὧν τὸ μέγα κλέος κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην διαβεβόηται καὶ ὑμνῆται*. Comp. *τοῦτο ὁ ποιήσας ἐαυτῷ μέγα κλέος ἐν Χριστῷ περιποιήσεται*. Clem. *Ep.* i. 54.

2. *Euterpe*: *ἀπὸ τοῦ τέρπειν τοὺς ἀκροωμένους*. Comp. the *ἐπιτερπῆ* in the passage from the second *Preface* (*vid. sup.*

¹ For this uncommon word, *vid. infr.* p. 154.

² Comp. *τὸ . . . ἡθὺς ἐνδείξασθωσαν*, Clem. *Ep.* i. 21.

³ So the message of our Lord (in the extract from Eusebius) to Simon Peter was rather to strengthen than to diminish or take away anything that had been promised or bestowed. *Vid. sup.* p. 143, where observe the thrice repeated *ἡλάττωσα*.

p. 147). A little below the writer promises *short* extracts, so as not ἐνοχλεῖν τοὺς ἀκούοντας.

3. Thalia: ἀπὸ τοῦ θάλλειν ἐπὶ πολλοὺς χρόνους τοὺς διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων ἐγκωμιαζομένους. Comp. Nos. 1, 7, 9.

4. Melpomene: ἀπὸ τῆς μελωδίας, δι' ἧς τοὺς ἀκούοντας ψυχαγωγεῖσθαι. Comp. with the words just given, and with the passage quoted on p. 147.

5. Terpsichore: ἀπὸ τοῦ τέρπειν κ.τ.λ. See No. 2. The expression, or that on p. 250, suggests 2 Macc. xv.

6. Erato: ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς παιδευθέντας ποθεινοὺς καὶ ἐπεράστους ἀποτελεῖν. Comp. first of all the ἐπιτερπῇ τὴν χάριν ἀποτελεῖ of the passage quoted on p. 147, and then ἐπέραστος γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἡ γλυκύτης τῶν πνευματικῶν μαθημάτων ἀγιάζουσα, καὶ αὐξάνουσα, καὶ τρέφουσα τὰς ψυχάς.

7. Polymnia: ἀπὸ τοῦ διὰ πολλῆς ὑμνήσεως ἐπιφανεῖς κατασκευάζειν τοὺς διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων ἀπαθανατιζομένους τῇ δόξῃ. Comp. ὕμνηται in No. 1. We shall return to this directly.

8. Urania: ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς παιδευθέντας ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἐξαίρεσθαι πρὸς οὐρανόν. Comp. εἰσόμεθα γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ τὰς λαμπρὰς τῶν δικαίων διανομάς, from first *Preface*.

9. Calliope: ἀπὸ τοῦ καλὴν ὅπα προῖεσθαι, τουτέστι, τῇ εὐεπείᾳ διάφορον οὔσαν, ἀποδοχῆς τυγχάνειν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκούοντων. Comp. ἡ γὰρ τοῦ κάλλους τῶν ἐγκειμένων ἐκλογὴ πρὸς¹ ἑαυτὴν ἔλκει τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας, οὐκ ἔῶσα καμῶν τὸ μέλλον ἀκοῦσαι ποθοῦντας, καὶ ὡς ἐν στιχηραῖς ᾄδεται ῥήσεσιν. With the last clause, comp. Nos. 3, 7.

The peculiar use (in both *Prefaces*) which has here been made of Diodorus will hardly, we should suppose, be denied; and we might, perhaps, be content to rest our denial of the authorship of John of Damascus on what has been already produced. The examination, however, of the Greek of these *Prefaces* is so instructive, and the results of the examination are so undeniable, that we shall pursue our investigations a great deal further.

Diodorus proceeds, at the bottom of p. 253 and onward, to give the history of Hercules. He does not say anything about Prodicus' myth of the "choice of Hercules." It would naturally occur to any one's mind. In both *Prefaces* there

¹ For π. i. i., *vid. infr.* p. 160.

is the opposition of "virtue" to "vice," and we shall see presently that "the choice of Hercules" was present in the writer's mind.

On p. 250, Diodorus speaks of Dionysus, adding κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐρεσιν τοῦ οἴνου μήπω τῆς ὕδατος κράσεως εὐρημένης. Comp. with the passage from the second *Preface*, on p. 147.

On p. 251, an account is given of Priapus, which extends on to p. 252, to the mention of the hermaphrodite. Diodorus has διαμονῆς εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα, which might have suggested the διανομὰς of the first *Preface*, for which see No. 8.

We observe, also, τὰ δὲ τοῦ σώματος μέρη περιπλάσασαν εἰς ἀνθρώπου τύπον . . . τὰς τιμὰς ἀπονέμουσι . . . προσηγορίας. If we turn to the *Ep. ad Theoph.* xxx., the section, that is, in which, on p. 118 sq., we found so much that was interesting, we remark ἐπίσης τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ, with τιμὴν τοῖς πρωτοτύποις ἀπονέμοντες in the next line, and followed after four lines by τῆς Χριστιανικῆς προσηγορίας, and after one line by βεβαίωσιν τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν δεδογματισμένων θεοπνεύστων λόγων. In the first *Preface*, as we have already seen (p. 148), we are told that the opinions of Philo and Josephus do not fall short of those of τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν . . . ἀνδρῶν . . . βεβαιούτα μᾶλλον . . . λόγια. The next line has θεοπνεύστου. In the same place the writer of *Theophilus* says that the glory of image-worship shines forth ἐν ἱστορίαις καὶ μουσουργήμασιν. The last word appears to have been coined expressly for the occasion, and is certainly appropriate to Diodorus' account of the Muses here given, and of which the writer of the *Prefaces* makes use. Observe the contempt for image-worship which lurks in the use of Diodorus' language by the writer of *Theophilus*.

On p. 251, just above the history of Priapus, it is said that Dionysus was the εὐρετὴν of certain games. In lib. i. 88, p. 98, Priapus is also spoken of. We observe here τὸ δὲ μόριον τοῦ σώματος, τὸ τῆς γενέσεως αἴτιον, τιμαῖσθαι προσήκόντως, ὥς ἂν ὑπάρχον ἀρχέγονον τῆς τῶν ζώων φύσεως . . . διὸ καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτῶν ἀνατιθέναι τοὺς πλείστους ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐντεταμένους. If, now, we turn to the very same sentence in Clem. *Ep.* i. 59, in which we have pointed out (p. 114) what appear to be two jokes, we find ἐλπίζειν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχέγονον πάσης κτίσεως ὀνομά (obs.) σου . . . μόριον εὐεργέτην (εὐρετὴν,

S. Light. p. 288), πνευμάτων καὶ Θεὸν πάσης σαρκός, τὸν ἐπιβλέποντα¹ ἐν ταῖς ἀβύσσοις, τὸν ἐπόπτην ἀνθρώπων ἔργων . . . τὸν παντὸς πνεύματος κτίστην καὶ ἐπίσκοπον. Comp. with Diodorus.

Compare also with both, ὁ δὲ ἀγαθός ἐστι Πρίαπος, ὁ πρὶν τι εἶναι ποιήσας· διὰ τοῦτο καλεῖται Πρίαπος, ὅτι ἐπριοποίησε τὰ πάντα· διὰ τοῦτο (obs.), φησὶν, εἰς πάντα ναὸν ἵσταται, ὑπὸ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως (obs.) τιμώμενος (obs.) καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς βαστάζων τὰς ὁπώρας (Diod. p. 252) ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, τουτέστι τοὺς καρπούς τῆς κτίσεως, ὧν αἴτιος (obs.) ἐγένετο, πριοποίησας τὴν κτίσιν πρότερον οὐκ οὔσαν, Hippol. Ref. v. 26 (Justin the Gnostic).

In lib. iii. 68, p. 238, Diodorus twice uses ἐπιτερπῆ, for which see the passage from the second *Preface*, on p. 147. In the same place Diodorus has γλυκύτητι, and half a dozen lines above it ἔτι δὲ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὕγιενόν. In the second *Preface* is γλυκύτης, with τὰ ἔτι (obs.) καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἀμείνω half a dozen lines above.

3. Ἀπαθανατίζειν (see No. 7 above) is a word likely to attract attention. Wesseling (Diodorus' editor) has a note upon it, and refers to lib. i. 2, p. 5. The word is there used, and in the following sentence Diodorus has ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, and in the preceding sentence τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν βίον τοῖς δὲ δι' ἀρετὴν περιποιησαμένοις δόξαν, αἱ πράξεις ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα μνημονεύονται, διαβοάμεναι τῷ θειοτάτῳ τῆς ἱστορίας στόματι. Comp. the κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην διαβεβόηται already observed in No. 1.

On p. 47 sq. the greater part of *Peregrin.* §§ 10, 11 is given.

¹ Comp. ἡ ἁγία Τριάς . . . καὶ οἷά τι οὔσα ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰωνίου καθημένη θώκου, ἐπιβλέπειν ἀβύσσους. Didymus, *De Trin.* ii. 1. This reference is given in the *Church Quarterly*, Oct. 1876, p. 244. We consult Didymus because of this coincidence with Clement. Further on in the same chapter, p. 114, Didymus has παριστῶν γαὺν τὸ τριαδικῶς. In the second *Preface* we find τὴν τριαδικὴν μονάδα, and, as we have already seen, παριστῶν. Presently Didymus has τὸ . . . ὑπερέχον ἄζωμα . . . τὸ . . . καὶ υἱὸς Θεοῦ ἡμᾶς ποιοῦν ὡς Πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας. Comp. from first *Preface* υἱὸς Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, and after two lines ὑπὲρ ἑλπίδα τὸ τῆς υἰοθεσίας ἄζωμα.

In chap. iii. Didymus considers the various titles of the Holy Spirit, and on p. 125 the Πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας appears again followed by the Πνεῦμα ἐπαγγελίας. Presently he has Πνεῦμα χάριτος, and the text ἐὰν ἀγαπᾷτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσατε, followed by ὁμοίотροπον, στιχιδίῳ, ἀνευφημήθη, and presently ὁμοιολεξία several times. We have seen the last word, which is an uncommon one, in the first *Preface*. In the second is ὁμοίотροπος, ἀνευφημουμένης. Comp. also στιχηραῖς (*vid. sup.*). In the opening twelve lines (*vid. sup.* p. 149) of the first *Preface* the other points are taken up, *vid. infr.* p. 159.

We observe there εἴτα ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα διεβεβόητο (comp. here with Diodorus), φυγὴν ἑαυτοῦ καταδικάσας ἐπλανᾶτο, ἄλλην ἄλλοτε ἀμείβων . . . ἐν βραχεὶ παιᾶδας ἀπέφηνε (comp. here with the τοὺς υἱοὺς . . . ἀπεφήνατο of first *Preface*, *vid. sup.* p. 151). After a few lines, given on p. 48, we have a sentence partly indebted to Diodorus (*vid. sup.* p. 88), and which has ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ οὐ μικρὸν αὐτῷ ἀξίωμα περιεποίησε πρὸς τὸν ἑξῆς βίον. The word ἀξίωμα is used in the first *Preface* (see note on p. 154), and for the rest of the sentence compare Diodorus' words quoted above. We recall ἄρτι δὲ ἄνδρα παιδείᾳ καὶ ἀξιώματι προὔχοντα of *Peregrin.* 19, found also in pseudo-Galen's *De Prænot.* (*vid. sup.* p. 80). Two lines above in *Peregrinus* we observe εἴ τις ἄλλος ἐν περιστάσει τοιαύτῃ. Now, here, in Diodorus (p. 4) we have οἱ δὲ πεπαιδευμένοι τῶν ὑπαιδεύτων πρόεχουσι. Comp. with *Peregrinus*. Five lines above Diodorus has περιστάσεων. On p. 250, a page used apparently (*vid. sup.* p. 153) in the second *Preface*, we have the more exact expression ταῖς τοιαύταις περιστάσεσι.

On p. 7, Diodorus says that he travelled for thirty years from country to country, acquiring the knowledge which was necessary for the composition of the history which he proposed to write. His words, as we shall see presently, seem to be partly used in the second *Preface*. Photius, *Bibl.* 170, expressly refers to them, and speaks of Diodorus as τόπους τε πολλοὺς ἀμείβων. Comp. the ἐπλανᾶτο, ἄλλην ἄλλοτε¹ ἀμείβων of *Peregrin.* 10, quoted above and on p. 47.

It would thus seem that *Peregrinus* is to some small extent connected with our *Prefaces* and the sources from which they are derived.

We return now to Diodorus, p. 5. In the pages in which we now find ourselves, the coincidences are very numerous, and to do full justice to them we should have to transcribe far more, both of Diodorus and of the *Prefaces*, than our space will permit. We must content ourselves with noticing some points only, and these not so fully as we could wish.

On p. 5, Diodorus has τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, four lines above αἰτία, and between the two words a passage in which ἀρετῆς is opposed

¹ The combination is suggested apparently by three lines of Theognis quoted, as we shall find presently, by Basil in *de legend. libr. Gentil.* The first of these lines ends with διαμεψόμεθα, and the third with ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει.

to κακίας, and further down on p. 5, ῥαδίως εὔροι. On p. 6 he has ἅπαντα τᾶλλα χρήσιμα τῇ γραφῇ περιεῖληφέναι. Comp. περιείληφεν δὲ ὅσα ἠθικῶς, ἢ γνωμικῶς, ἢ παραινετικῶς πρὸς πᾶσαν αἰτίαν τε καὶ ὑπόθεσιν τῇ τε Παλαιᾷ καὶ Νέᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν λογίων Γραφῇ λέλεκται . . . τὰ περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας περιείληφεν. διὰ τὸ εὔληπτον δὲ καὶ ῥαδίως εὗρίσκειν κ.τ.λ. Comp. with Diodorus. Comp. also Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* iv. 48 τῇ παλαιᾷ παρθένω τὰ τῆς νέας ἐπιδεικνὺς ἐταίρας σχήματα. οὐ νέμεσις τοῖνυν οὐδὲ Ἴππωνι, ἀπαθανατίζοντι (*vid. sup.* p. 154) κ.τ.λ.

On p. 6, Diodorus says that history blames the bad but extols the good (we have just found ἀρετῆς opposed to κακίας), and has ἔχειν τῷ συμφέροντι followed after a few lines by προαίρεσιν, with τὸ συμφέρον in the next line. Comp. ῥαδίαν δὲ τὴν τοῦ συμφέροντος ἀίρεσιν ἔξομεν, παραλλήλους θέντες τὰς ἀρετάς, καὶ τὰς . . . κακίας. We shall find presently πρὸς ἀλλήλους τιθέντες.

On the same p. 6 we find ἐμπείριαν μεγίστην . . . τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι followed presently by κειμένης γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσα τῆς ὠφελείας. Comp. with the passage from the second *Preface*, given on p. 147.

At the bottom of p. 6, Diodorus says that no writer had ever attempted to write a connected history of all times and circumstances; that history therefore was contained in many volumes, by as many different writers, and (p. 7) that the ἀνάληψις (κατάληψις in *Preface*) of it was δυσπερίληπτος (comp. the εὔληπτον just above) and δυσμνημόνευτος (comp. the passage from the second *Preface*, given on p. 147). This great work, hitherto unattempted, Diodorus proposed to undertake, making it as profitable as possible, ἐλάχιστα δὲ τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας ἐνοχλήσουσαν. Comp. the μὴ . . . ἐνοχλεῖν τοὺς ἀκούοντας (*vid. sup.* No. 2). The preceding sentence in the *Preface* is πολλὴν δὲ χρεῖαν εἰσφέρει τῷ συντάγματι. The following sentence in Diodorus contains εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν . . . τῶν συνταγμάτων. The sentence following ἐνοχλεῖν in the *Preface* is μάλιστα δὲ ἐξηύρηται διὰ τὸ ὁμοιότροπα (see note, p. 154), ἡγουν τὰ ἐπὶ ἑνὸς πράγματος πολλαχῶς λεγόμενα. The next sentence in Diodorus begins with ἢ δ' ἐν μίᾳ συντάξεως πραγματείᾳ, and is followed presently by μάλιστα μὲν . . . ἔπειτα καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ χορηγίαν τῶν πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην (in

same part of *Preface*) ὑπόθεσιν ἀνηκόντων. Comp. ὁμοιότροπα, etc.

On p. 8, Diodorus has ἀνελάβομεν ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων. Comp. τὸ διὰ μνήμης ἀναλαβεῖν (*vid. sup.* p. 147).

The preceding sentence in the *Preface* is περὶ ὧν μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐν τοῖς τόποις γενομένης βραχέα ἐρῶ, σαφῶς τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν χρήσιμον παριστᾶν. Here, on p. 8, Diodorus has βούλομαι βραχέα προδιορίσαι περὶ κ.τ.λ., and on p. 12, . . . τῶν χρησίων κατὰ μικρὸν καὶ κ.τ.λ. followed by περὶ δὲ τῶν πράξεων . . . γενομένων δὲ ἐν τοῖς γνωριζομένοις τόποις τῆς οἰκουμένης διεξιέναι πειρασόμεθα.

On the same p. 8, Diodorus has πεποιήμεθα δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπὸ τῶν μυθολογουμένων . . . τῶν γὰρ βίβλων ἡμῖν ἔξ αἱ πρῶται περιέχουσι . . . καὶ τούτων αἱ μὲν . . . ἀνεγεγράφαμεν . . . ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἐξῆς εἴκοσι καὶ τρισὶ (obs.) βίβλοις κ.τ.λ., and on p. 9 ὥστε τὴν ὕλην πραγματείαν ἡμῶν τεσσαράκοντα βίβλων οὔσαν. Comp., from the second *Preface*, πᾶσα δὲ ἡ πραγματεία ἐν τρισὶ (obs.) βίβλοις ἀναγέγραπται· καὶ τούτων ἡ μὲν πρώτη συγκείμεται ἀφ' ὧν μάλιστα προσήκοι χριστιανοῖς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀεὶ ποιῆσθαι, ἀπὸ (obs.) Θεοῦ τὴν τριαδικὴν (see note, p. 154) μονάδα (obs.) φωτίζουσιν ἐκ προοιμίων (obs.) ἡμᾶς. On p. 15, Diodorus has τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κόσμου συγκεῖσθαι πᾶν ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων (obs.). Compare. Diodorus is speaking of many gods τρέφοντάς τε καὶ αὔξοντας πάντα (cf. αὐξάνουσα καὶ τρέφουσα τὰς ψυχάς, *vid. sup.* p. 152).

The coincidence between the *Preface* and Diodorus in τρισὶ βίβλοις is worthy of special notice, for it happens that the writer of the *Preface* gives an untrue description of the *Sacr. Par.* The contents are not divided into three books, but ranged under the letters of the alphabet. Editors are obliged to suppose that John of Damascus changed his mind. It was no part of the writer's plan to give a truthful account of the *Sacr. Par.*

On p. 12, Diodorus has πρὸς ἀλλήλους τιθέντες σύμβολα. Comp. παραλλήλους θέντες (*vid. sup.* p. 156). A few lines above he has ἐπὶ τὰς νομὰς σποράδην ἐξίεναι. In the second *Preface* we find καὶ τὰ περὶ τούτων σποράδην κείμενα ἀποφθέγματα ἠνθολόγηται. In the parallel passage in the first *Preface* there is ἠθροίσθησαν. Diodorus has here ἀθροίζομένους in close company with σποράδην. This last word evidently ex-

cited some attention. Comp. ἐπικειμένων αὐτῶ νήσων σποράδην. Diod. iii. 44, p. 212, in the midst, that is, of the pages used for the manufacture of the so-called excerpts from Agatharchides. This use of σποράδην might well be remembered. Eusebius, also, *H. E.* i. 1, very appropriately writes: ὅσα τοίνυν εἰς τὴν προκειμένην λυσιτελήσειν ὑπόθεσιν ἡγούμεθα, τῶν αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις σποράδην μνημονευθέντων ἀναλεξάμενοι, καὶ ὥς ἂν ἐκ λογικῶν λειμῶνων τὰς ἐπιτηδεύουσ αὐτῶν τῶν πάλαι συγγραφέων ἀπανθισάμενοι (obs.) φωνάς κ.τ.λ.

The sentence in Diodorus which contains σποράδην begins thus: τοὺς δὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεννηθέντας τῶν ἀνθρώπων φασὶν ἐν ἀτάκτῃ καὶ θηριάδει βίῃ καθεστῶτας, σποράδην κ.τ.λ. Diodorus alludes to the lines (in which the keenest interest was felt in several quarters) ἦν χρόνος ὅτ' ἦν ἄτακτος ἀνθρώπων βίος καὶ θηριάδης ἰσχύος θ' ὑπρέτης κ.τ.λ. Sextus Empir. *M.* ix. 54, introduces them by saying that Critias maintained ὅτι οἱ παλαιοὶ νομεῖται ἐπίσκοπὸν τινα τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων κατορθωμάτων καὶ ἀμαρτημάτων ἐπλάσαν τὸν θεὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲνα λάθρα τὸν πλησίον ἀδικεῖν εὐλαβούμενον τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν τιμωρίαν. Comp. the words from Clement's *Ep.* i. 59, quoted on p. 154. The idea, that Clement is looking in the same direction as Diodorus, is confirmed by the fact that Diodorus presently has τὰ πρῶτα γενόμενα συστήματα τῶν ἀπάντων ἐθνῶν ἀρχέγονα γενέσθαι, and further on πρῶτους τῶν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων εὐρετὰς γενέσθαι (*vid. sup.* p. 154). The writer of *Diognetus* seems also to look in the same direction when he says, μέχρι μὲν οὖν τοῦ πρόσθεν χρόνου εἶπεν ἡμᾶς ὡς ἐβουλόμεθα ἀτάκτοις φοραῖς φέρεσθαι. *Diognet.* ix. 1. Comp. with *Diognetus*, οὐκ ἔδῃ αὐτὰς ἀτάκτως φέρεσθαι κ.τ.λ., a version of Num. xxvii. 17 (*Philo*, i. p. 170). The 16th verse runs: ἐπισκεψάσθω Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκὸς ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς συναγωγῆς ταύτης. Comp. with Clement's § 59, quoted on p. 154. This curious coincidence would very naturally arise if Clement's Epistle and *Diognetus* were by the same author.

4. It may be remembered (*vid. sup.* p. 152, No. 6) that we found the word ἐπεράστος to be used both in Diodorus and in the second *Preface*. It is used several times by Lucian, but otherwise does not appear to be common. In *Philo*, i. p. 671, we find ἅτε ἀληθείας τῆς ἐπεράστου γέμοντα. Comp. ἐπεράστος γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς, *vid. sup.* p. 152.

On the same page Philo has *βουλομένοις δὲ τὴν ἀφέλειαν*, and on the preceding page *μετὰ πάσης εὐμαρείας*. Comp. with the passage from the second *Preface*, quoted on p. 147.

On this last page (p. 670) Philo has *τὸ παρόν*, and in the same sentence *μέγα καὶ ἐχυρὸν κτήμα καὶ ἀγώνισμα ἀρετῆς*. In the beginning of the second *Preface* is *τὸ παρόν*, and the first words of the first *Preface* are *κτῆμα τίμιον ἢ ἀρετή*. Philo may merely have given the suggestion; at any rate, we shall find a better parallel presently.

Here, also, Philo has *δυσμενές*, and the *Preface* *ὑπὸ δυσμενῶν ἀνευφημουμένης*. For the last word, see note, p. 154.

5. We are now in a position to come to some definite conclusions concerning the *Prefaces* which we have been examining. The use, and the very extraordinary use, of Diodorus, not to mention Philo and Didymus, cannot be disputed. The coincidences which have been produced belong to all parts of both *Prefaces*, and prove that these *Prefaces* were written by the same person. This person could not have been John of Damascus; in the first place, because, from internal evidence, as Lequien (*vid. sup.* p. 147) shows, we must hold the first *Preface* and part of the second to be later additions; in the next place, because it is impossible to believe that a writer of the eighth century, thinking in and speaking Greek every day, would use Diodorus in the way that the writer of the *Prefaces* certainly did. These *Prefaces* are mere literary mosaics, and very obviously the work of far later times than those of John of Damascus.

If this conclusion concerning the *Prefaces* is a just one, it is not at all difficult to understand, at any rate, one object which the writer had in view in prefixing them to the *Sacra Parallela*. The sentence, indeed, concerning Philo and Josephus (*vid. sup.* p. 146), standing as it does in both *Prefaces* in the same words, sufficiently explains this object. The writer wanted to encourage the study of these and other ancient writers not Christian. Living at a time when the study of ancient Greek literature was attracting notice in *some* quarters, but being frowned down in *others*, he wanted to contradict the notion that the Church had always looked askance at such study. We speak of course with diffidence here. We know for certain what Greek passed before our writer's eyes, and what

use he made of it; but we do not *know*, we can only guess, what his thoughts and intentions were. We only surmise that one among the objects which he had in view, when writing these *Prefaces*, was that which we have just stated. We have, however, some rather interesting evidence to produce, which seems to give colour to our surmise.

6. Among the writings of Basil is one called *Sermo de legendis libris Gentilium*. This treatise, first published (in Latin) in 1507, has been constantly used in support of classical study. If we turn to § 4 we find Basil's version of Prodicus' speech on the meeting of Hercules with "Virtue" and "Vice." The "two ways," one or other of which Hercules was invited to choose, are very constantly referred to by our authors with more or less of openness. In our *Prefaces* we have pointed out the opposition between "virtue" and "vice" (*vid. sup.* p. 156). If we run our eye down Basil's narrative, we observe εἶναι γὰρ τὴν μὲν ὑπὸ κομμωτικῆς (obs.) δισκευασμένην εἰς κάλλος . . . ἔλκειν ἐπιχειρεῖν τὸν Ἡρακλέα πρὸς ἑαυτὴν, and presently πειρατέον ἐπὶ τοῦ βίου δεικνύναι τοὺς λόγους· ὡς ὅ γε τὴν ἄχρι ῥημάτων παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις φιλοσοφίαν ἔργῳ βεβαιῶν, and after four lines οἷον ἐπὶ τῶν πινάκων ἐκεῖνος ἔδειξεν, and after one line μακροὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἀποτείνειν λόγους. Comp., from the second *Preface*, ἡ γὰρ τοῦ κάλλους τῶν ἐγκειμένων ἐκλογὴ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἔλκει κ.τ.λ. (*vid. sup.* p. 152), and after a few lines τὰ περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας, with ὁ πίναξ in the next line. Further on in the same *Preface* λέξις ὁδηγοῦσα καὶ ἔλκουσα, and after a few lines καὶ ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ νέμειν τὰ αὐτὰ ἀγαγνώσματα τοῖς ἐν ῥήμασι, καὶ οὐκ ἐν πράγμασι κεχωρισμένοις, μακροὺς ἀποτείνωμεν λόγους, with τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας τῷ πίνακι after two lines. These resemblances cannot have accidentally arisen; and that they have not is further shown by observing in § 2, παράλληλα θέντας, which may be compared with παραλλήλους τιθέντες in the first *Preface*, and for which we have already found a "parallel" (πρὸς ἀλλήλους τιθέντες) in Diodorus (*vid. sup.* p. 157). The *Prefaces* to the *Sacr. Par.* cannot then be independent of Basil's treatise. Would it not seem that, equally with other lovers of classical study, our writer was attracted by the *de legendis libris Gentilium*?

Some one will perhaps now be ready to point out that by producing Basil's παράλληλα θέντας as a "parallel" to the

expression of the *Preface*, for which a "parallel" has been previously found, we have in some measure pulled down what we only just now were so carefully building up, and have cast a doubt upon the force of the coincidences between Diodorus and the *Prefaces* which have been pointed out. Duplicate coincidences, one or other of which must be accidental, may doubtless be sometimes found. We have not knowingly kept any in the background. We have shown on p. 19 what must be done with these when they are found. This particular duplicate, however, presents no difficulty whatever, for Basil has πρὸς ἀλλήλους (with Diodorus) in the selfsame sentence. The coincidence only sends us to Basil's treatise to see what else we can find.

In the beginning of § 3, Basil writes: ταυτὰ δὲ ταῦτα λέγειν καὶ περὶ συγγραφῶν ἔχω καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ψυχαγωγίας ἕνεκα (obs.) τῶν ἀκουόντων λογοποιῶσι. Comp. with the passage from Phot. *Bibl.* 244 (the hermaphrodite), quoted on p. 148.

Just below παράλληλα (in § 2) Basil speaks of Moses, and says οὗ μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὄνομα . . . οὕτω προσελθεῖν τῇ θεωρίᾳ κ.τ.λ. Comp. the ἀξίας ἐπαίνου μεγάλου καὶ ἐν πολλῇ δόξῃ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἦν, ὡς οἶσθα, καὶ μέγα ἦν τοῦνομα Γαληνοῦ . . . ἐκ θεωρίας κ.τ.λ. of pseudo-Galen, p. 625, quoted on p. 91. Basil has somewhat similar words in his description of the "choice of Hercules:" καὶ σχεδὸν ἅπαντες, ὧν δὲ καὶ λόγος τίς ἐστιν ἐπὶ¹ σοφίᾳ, ἢ μικρὸν ἢ μείζον, εἰς δύνανμιν ἕκαστος ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν συγγράμμασιν, ἀρετῆς ἐπαινον διεξῆλθον. Comp. with pseudo-Galen as above, and also with his ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι σχεδὸν ἅπαντες οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἀξιώματί τε καὶ παιδείᾳ προὔχοντες, p. 612, quoted on p. 80. These last words are also found in *Peregrin.* 19. We have shown on p. 155 that *Peregrin.* 19 seems to be indebted to Diodorus, i. 2, p. 5. Turning once more to Diodorus, p. 5, we remark πάντες δὲ μεγάλων ἐπαίνων ἡξιώθησαν (comp. with pseudo-Galen) . . . τὰ

¹ The scholiast on Arist. *Nub.* 360 says: μέμνηται δὲ νῦν τοῦ Προδίκου διασῶραν ὅτι μεγίστην (obs.) δόξαν (comp. with pseudo-Galen) εἶχε περὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς ὑπὲρ πάντας ὧν τῇ σοφίᾳ σοφιστῆς δὲ ἦν ὁ Πρόδικος, Χίος τὸ γένος. . . διαβάλλει. For the last word, *vid. sup.* p. 91, where the whole passage of pseudo-Galen is given. It must not be forgotten that we have shown on pp. 89, 90 that pseudo-Galen's treatise is in close contact with the excerpt from Diodorus (on hermaphrodites) at that point (or near to it) where the coincidences with the second *Preface* are found. *Vid. sup.* p. 148.

μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα μνημεῖα. διαμένει χρόνον ὀλίγον, ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἀναιρούμενα περιστάσεων· ἡ δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας δύναμις ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην (used in *Preface*), διήκουσα . . . πρὸς λόγου δύναμιν (comp. with Basil) . . . οὐκ ἂν τις ῥαδίως εὗροι (used in *Preface*) . . . εἰ δὲ πεπαιδευμένοι τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν προέχουσι (used by the writer of *Peregrinus*, and perhaps by pseudo-Galen). We have taken these things from only ten lines of Diodorus. Compare also τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τῶν κτημάτων, οὐ μᾶλλον τῶν ἐχόντων ἢ καὶ οὐτίμοσιν τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων ἐστίν, . . . μεταβαλλόμενα· μόνη δὲ κτημάτων ἡ ἀρετὴ ἀναφαίρετον, καὶ ζῶντι καὶ τελευτήσαντι παραμένουσα. This sentence is found in Basil's § 4, immediately before the "choice of Hercules," and will be fully considered hereafter.

We gave some words just now out of Basil's description of "the choice of Hercules," which supplied a coincidence with the second *Preface*. Among them was κομωτικῆς. This word seems at one time to have excited considerable interest. Stephens in his *Thesaurus* has a very long comment upon it, and cites Plato, *Gorg.* pp. 463, 465. At the bottom of p. 465, we find ἴσως μὲν οὖν ἀποπον πεποίηκα, ὅτι σε οὐκ ἔω (οὐκ ἔῶσα, second *Preface*), μακροὺς λόγους λέγειν, αὐτὸς μακρὸν λόγον ἀποτετάκα. We have already given (p. 160) μακροὺς ἀποτείνειν λόγους as a coincidence between Basil and the second *Preface*. It would certainly seem that Basil took the words from Plato. The οὐκ ἔῶσα suggests that the writer of the second *Preface* did the same. The way in which Plato introduces them make them more noticeable than they would otherwise be, and therefore more easily remembered.

What is the meaning of all these coincidences? Do they not suggest the possibility, and even probability, that this treatise, *de legend. libr. Gent.*, is not the work of Basil? This is actually the case. The treatise is spurious. In not a few instances the great name of Basil has been tacked on to writings of which he was guiltless; and here, in this case, some late writer has sought to palm off his eulogy of classical study as if from the pen of Basil the Great.

To make this grave charge good, we need travel very little away from the story of Hercules' choice, which lies here before us.

Pseudo-Basil writes:—

Καὶ μὴν καὶ ὁ Κεῖδς που¹ σοφιστῆς Πρόδικος τῶν ἑαυτοῦ συγγραμμάτων ἀδελφὰ τοῦτοις εἰς ἀρετὴν καὶ κακίαν ἐφιλοσόφησεν . . . ἔχει δὲ οὕτω πως ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ, ὅσα ἐγὼ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τῆς διανοίας μέμνημαι, ἐπεὶ τὰ γε ῥήματα οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι, πλὴν γε δὴ ὅτι ἀπλῶς οὕτως εἴρηκεν ἄνευ μέτρου. ὅτι νέψ' ὄντι τῷ Ἑρακλεῖ κομιδῇ, καὶ σχεδὸν ταύτην ἄγοντι τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἣν καὶ ὑμεῖς νῦν, βουλευομένῳ ποτέραν τράπηται τῶν ὁδῶν, τὴν διὰ τῶν πόνων ἄγουσαν πρὸς ἀρετὴν, ἣ τὴν ῥάστην, προσελθεῖν δύο γυναῖκας, ταύτας δὲ εἶναι Ἀρετὴν καὶ Κακίαν.

We naturally conclude from this that the writer had at one time seen the Ὄραι of Prodicus (which still he does not call by that name), but not recently, and that therefore he remembered nothing but the general drift of the story, and that the narrative was not in verse. In point of fact, however, the writer had Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 20 sq., not merely in his mind as a recollection of his youthful studies, but actually before him.

Xenophon writes:—

. . . ὥς φασιν οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες· λέγει δὲ που καὶ Ἡσίοδος·

Τὴν μὲν γὰρ κακότητα καὶ ἱλαδὸν ἔστιν ἐλέσθαι
 Ῥηϊδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει.
 Τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάρουθεν ἔθηκαν
 Ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν
 Καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,
 Ῥηϊδίῃ δὴ ἔπειτα πέλει, χαλεπή περ ἐοῦσα.

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Ἐπίχαρμος ἐν τῷδε·

Τῶν πόνων πολλοῦσιν ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ γὰρ οἱ θεοί.

Καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ τόπῳ φησὶν·

ᾧ πονηρέ, μὴ τὰ μαλακὰ μῶεο, μὴ τὰ σκλήρ' ἔχῃς.

Καὶ Πρόδικος δὲ ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἑρακλέους, ὅπερ δὴ καὶ πλείστοις ἐπιθεῖκνυται, ὡσαύτως περὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀποφαίνεται ὡδὲ πως λέγων, ὅσα ἐγὼ μέμνημαι· φησὶ γὰρ Ἑρακλέα, ἐπεὶ ἐκ παίδων εἰς ἥβην ὠρμᾶτο, ἐν ᾗ οἱ νέοι ἤδη αὐτοκράτορες γιγνόμενοι δηλοῦσιν, εἴτε τὴν δι' ἀρετῆς ὁδὸν τρέφονται ἐπὶ τὸν βίον, εἴτε τὴν διὰ κακίας, ἐξελθόντα εἰς ἡσυχίαν καθῆσθαι, ἀπορῶντα, ὅποτέραν τῶν ὁδῶν τράπηται· καὶ φανῆναι αὐτῷ δύο γυναῖκας προΐεναι μεγάλας κ.τ.λ. . . . οὕτω πως (obs.) διώκει Πρόδικος τὴν ὑπ' Ἀρετῆς Ἑρακλέους παιδευσιν, ἐκόσμησε μέντοι τὰς γυνάμας ἔτι μεγαλειότεροις ῥήμασιν ἢ ἐγὼ νῦν.

The ὅσα ἐγὼ μέμνημαι common to the two accounts is very amusing, and ought in itself alone to convince every one that Basil never wrote *de legend. libr. Gent.*

In addition, however, to the coincidences between the two accounts now shown, there is further evidence at hand of the

¹ See note, p. 161.

actual use of Xenophon. In § 3, pseudo-Basil uses the very lines of Hesiod which Xenophon does. He mentions the name of Hesiod. He does not quote the lines, but takes them to pieces. He has ὅτι τραχεῖα μὲν πρῶτον . . . καὶ ἰδρῶτος . . . ὁδὸς . . . διὰ τὸ ὄρθιον . . . ῥαδίως ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον ἐλθεῖν . . . ὥς μὲν λεία . . . ὥς δὲ ῥαδία . . . ἦν ἀθρόον εἶναι λαβεῖν ἐκ τοῦ σύνεγγος ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος ποιητῆς ἔφησεν. ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ δοκεῖ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ . . . προκαλούμενος ἅπαντας ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι, ταῦτα διελθεῖν, καὶ ὥστε μὴ καταμαλακισθέντας κ.τ.λ. We cannot deny the use of the lines of Hesiod. But if we do not, we cannot, seeing the way in which the writer has used these lines, in common fairness deny that his ἅπαντας ἀγαθοὺς was taken from Xenophon, or that his καταμαλακισθέντας was suggested by the τὰ μαλακά of Epicharmus.

For the lines of Hesiod and Epicharmus with which Xenophon precedes the story of Prodicus, pseudo-Basil substitutes three ¹ lines which, with Plutarch, he ascribes to Solon, and then two lines of Theognis. In Stobæus, *Flor.* i. (περὶ ἀρετῆς) 16, p. 4 (Meineke), the three lines are found ascribed to Theognis. They are immediately followed by the lines from Hesiod which Xenophon gives. These lines appear to be found only in Plutarch and Stobæus. Now, observe, on p. 2, Stobæus gives a fragment from Euripides, not found elsewhere, the first line of which is οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρετῆς κτῆμα τιμιώτερον. Comp. the first words of the first *Preface*, κτῆμα τίμιον ἢ ἀρετή.

If the writer of *de legend. libr. Gent.* was not Basil,—and we certainly have found sufficient evidence to satisfy us that he was not,—but a far later writer, a scholar and a student gradually putting together his treatise as opportunity offered, he would feel some interest as to the times in which Prodicus lived, and would probably refer to Cyril of Alexandria, who in his *Orat.* i. *contr. Jul.* deals with chronology. Accordingly, on p. 13 (Spanheim), we find that Cyril assigns Prodicus and others to the 86th Olympiad. Four lines afterwards he describes Aristotle as βραχεῖαν ἄγοντα κομιδῇ τὴν ἡλικίαν. Comp. with the words of pseudo-Basil above. It seems likely that the writer's eye travelled over the earlier pages of Cyril, for on p. 10 Cyril has (speaking of Moses) νέος δὲ ἂν ἔτι καὶ

¹ See note, p. 155.

τῆς Αἰγυπτίων σοφίας εἰς πείραν ἔλθων, οἷόν τι προγύμνασμα τῶν θειοτέρων, ἐποιεῖτο τὰ ἀνθρώπινα. καταγόντες τοίνυν ἔξ Ἀβραάμ τοὺς χρόνους ἐπὶ Μωσέα Ἀτλαντά τε τὸν Προμηθέως, ἀρξάμεθα πάλιν ἐντεῦθεν ἑτέρας ἐτῶν ἀρχῆς κ.τ.λ. Comp. pseudo-Basil's words in § 2 λέγεται τοίνυν καὶ Μαῦσῃς ἐκεῖνος ὁ πάνυ, οὗ μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἐπὶ σοφία παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὄνομα, τοῖς Αἰγυπτίων μαθημασιν ἐγγυμνασάμενος τὴν διάνοιαν, οὕτω προσελθεῖν τῇ θεωρίᾳ τοῦ ὄντος. παραπλησίως δὲ τούτῳ καὶ τοῖς κάτω χρόνοις κ.τ.λ., and after five lines ἵν' ἐντεῦθεν ἀρξώμαι.

Another thing with respect to pseudo-Basil's treatise must be observed. It shows signs of the writer's interest in words just in the same way that the other writings which we have been examining do. We have already seen an example of this in *κοιμωτική*. We shall now take the sentence (partly quoted on p. 162) immediately preceding the lines of Solon and Theognis that usher in the "choice of Hercules," and show another example of the same thing.

The sentence is this:—

τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τῶν κτημάτων, οὐ μᾶλλον τῶν ἐχόντων ἢ καὶ οὐτινοσοῦν τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ἐν παιδιᾷ κύβων τῇδε κάκεῖσε μεταβαλλόμενα· μόνῃ δὲ κτημάτων ἡ ἀρετὴ ἀναφαίρετον, καὶ ζῶντι καὶ τελευτήσαντι παραμένουσα.

The writer has been saying that he was acquainted with a certain person who maintained that "all Homer's poetry was the praise of virtue," and who gave a sort of allegorical interpretation of the preservation of Ulysses from shipwreck—but naked. He has ἂν εὖξασθαι. He says that this interpreter of the poet's mind contended that Homer only fell short of saying ὅτι Ἀρετῆς ὑμῖν ἐπιμελητέον, ὃ ἄνθρωποι, ἢ καὶ ναυαγῆσαντι συνεκνήχεται, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς χέρσου γενόμενον γυμνὸν τιμιάτερον ἀποδείξει τῶν εὐδαιμόνων Φαιάκων.

The word ἀναφαίρετος is not often used. Comp. γίνεται δὲ ὁ μὲν ἔπαινος ἐπ' ἀρετᾷ, ὁ δὲ μακαρισμὸς ἐπ' εὐτυχίᾳ. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ τοῖς παρ' ἀρετὰς ἀγαθοῖς γίνεται τοιοῦτος, ὁ δ' εὐδαιμόν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς διὰ τύχην. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ ἀναφαίρετον ἔχει τὰν ἀρετάν, ὁ δ' εὐδαιμόν ἐστὶν ὅκ' ἀφαιρέεται τὰν εὐδαιμοσύναν. And presently, in another extract from the same writing (on same page), μεταβολοῖσας τὰς τύχας. These words are from an excerpt from Archytas given by Stobæus, *Flor.* i. 72, p. 30, that is to say, from the same *Sermo* in which

we found the lines from Theognis and from Hesiod side by side, and also the line from Euripides, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρετῆς κτήμα τιμιώτερον, which may now be compared with pseudo-Basil. The very first line of the *Sermo* is ἀρετῆς βέβαιαι δ' εἰσὶν αἱ κτήσεις μόναι, which also compare.

This *Sermo* contains also, p. 54, Xenophon's account of the "choice of Hercules." Everything, therefore, was ready to the writer's hand. This account has ἐπιμελητέον. Compare. Virtue is also described in it as φύσει κεκοσμημένην τὸ μὲν σῶμα καθαριότητι; while pseudo-Basil has here ἐπειδὴ περ αὐτὸν (Ulysses) ἀρετῇ ἀντὶ ἱματίων κεκοσμημένον ἐποίησε.

Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* ii. 16 (i. p. 77), has εὐχὴν δὲ χήρας καὶ ἐκβεβλημένης ἀναφαίρετον ἔᾶ. ὅσα γὰρ ἂν εὕξεται (comp. ἂν εὕξασθαι), φησί, κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς, μένει (obs.) αὐτῇ. The point of interest is the circumstance that Philo is here in the midst of his explanation of the words καὶ ἦσαν οἱ δύο γυμνοὶ κ.τ.λ., Gen. ii. 25. He has expounded two kinds of nakedness, and goes on immediately to expound a third. The history of pseudo-Basil's passage seems now perfectly plain. Reading through Stobæus' *Sermo* on "Virtue," he lighted upon the extract from Archytas. He observed ἀναφαίρετος, and remembered the use of it by Philo, and consequently Philo's interpretations of "nakedness." It then struck him that it would be a good joke to allegorize in Philo's fashion.

Our readers may observe pseudo-Basil's ἐν παιδιᾷ κύβων. The explanation of this gave us some trouble, for we could see no sufficient suggestion. It occurred to us at last that the writer would doubtless remember the account given of Archytas by Diogenes Laertius (lib. xiii.). If he did, he would be likely to remember and to "look at" the closing words καὶ γεωμετρίᾳ πρῶτος κύβον εὔρεν, ὥς φησι Πλάτων ἐν πολιτείᾳ.

We consider it now to be sufficiently proved that Basil did not write *de legend. libr. Gent.* The title suggests a far later date than the fourth century. The coincidences with the *Prefaces* to the *Sacr. Par.* and other writings point to the same conclusion. The results of the examination of this treatise strongly support our conjecture as to the object (or one object) which the writer of the *Prefaces* had in view in prefixing them to the *Sacr. Par.* This conjecture is further confirmed by the fact that Meineke in his edition of the *Flori-*

legium of Stobæus adds an *Appendix ex cod. MS. Florentino Parallelorum Sacrorum Joannis Damasceni*. It is said :—

Profanorum Scriptorum sententiæ ex Ioannis Damasceni Parallelis quæ continentur in cod. xxii. plutei viii. bibl. Laurent. chartac. in 4° min. sæculi xii. vel xiii. excerptæ, quæ Stobæi Florilegio vel corrigendo vel uberiori reddendo maxime sunt profuturæ.—SARTIUS.

There is also the following note :—

A prima codicis pagina usque ad p. 74, nulli auctores profani recensentur, nisi Philo et Josephus (observe this); quorum sententias prætermisimus describere, quum inter sacros in Ioannis Damasceni Sacris Parallelis editis adcenseantur.—SARTIUS.

§ 8. We have ventured on p. 131 to suggest the possibility that the words βία Θεῷ οὐ πρόσσεστιν, ἀγαθὴ δὲ γνώμη πάντοτε συμπάρεστιν αὐτῷ are not those which were originally written by Irenæus, but a translation of the old Latin: “*Vis enim a Deo non fit, sed bona sententia adest illi semper.*” The curious connection of this sentence with *Diognetus*, Clement’s *Ep. i.*, and the Book of Wisdom, is plainly pointed out on p. 132. In succeeding pages four passages have been produced, each containing the leading idea of the sentence, and each *apparently* used in *Diognetus* and Clement’s *Ep. i.* One of these parallel passages has been found in the *Sacr. Par.* of John of Damascus, and almost alongside of it a text of Scripture altered, so as to convey the leading idea of the sentence, in the language of that particular parallel passage which stands in its near neighbourhood. This altered text of Scripture occurs in an extract from a writer to whom, elsewhere in the *Sacr. Par.*, the first clause of the sentence in question is ascribed. Other extracts from this writer have been shown to be late additions to the *Sacr. Par.* All these various circumstances tend to give to the coincidence between the latter part of the sentence and the Book of Wisdom a far greater importance than would otherwise belong to it. This coincidence, if it has not accidentally arisen, shows that the Greek of the sentence before us is not Irenæus’, but from the pen of a translator probably, though not certainly, of later date than John of Damascus. If we can find under circumstances not less remarkable as good a coincidence for the earlier half of the sentence as we have already found for the later, the conclusion

that the whole sentence is a translation, and therefore probably an interpolation, will almost necessarily follow.

We have lately seen reason to suppose that our writers made use of Stobæus' *Florilegium*. It may be remembered that on p. 25 a striking coincidence between *Flor.* xliii. 18, 20, pp. 82, 83, and Clement's *Ep.* i. §§ 36, 37, has been pointed out. These sections declare the necessity of due order and harmony in the Church of Christ. They might almost be said to be written *περὶ πολιτείας*, which is the "title" of the *Sermo* of Stobæus in which the coincidence with Clement is found. *Diognet.* v. describes the life of the primitive Christians, and is the *περὶ πολιτείας* section of this writing.

In *Flor.* xliii. 25, p. 83, half a dozen lines below those which give the coincidence with Clement, there is a single line from Sophocles which is not found elsewhere: νόμοις ἔπεςθαι τοῖσιν ἐγχώροις καλόν. Comp. ἐν τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις ἔθεσιν ἀκολοθοῦντες . . . ἐνδείκνυνται τὴν κατάστασιν τῆς ἐαυτῶν πολιτείας, *Diognet.* v. 4. This is very suggestive.

In 37, p. 86, Stobæus gives a passage from Xenophon which explains the distinction between βασιλείας and τυραννίδας. In *Diognet.* vii. a distinction is drawn between βασιλεύς and τύραννος.

In 63, p. 92, Stobæus cites a passage in which Plato describes, in his familiar style, various forms of government. The passage begins with ἄρ' οὐ μοναρχία . . . ; Ναί. καὶ μετὰ μοναρχίαν εἴποι τις ἄν . . . ; πῶς κ.τ.λ. Presently Plato says that the μοναρχία has two forms and two names: τὸ μὲν τυραννίδι, τὸ δὲ βασιλικῇ. Comp. with ἄρά γε, ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἂν τις λογίσαιτο, ἐπὶ τυραννίδι . . . ; οὐ μὲν οὖν, of *Diognet.* vii., quoted on p. 132. The writer of *Diognetus* nowhere else adopts the same style.

In 75, p. 95, Stobæus quotes Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 10 :—

ἐγὼ δ' οἶμαι τοὺς φρόνησιν ἀσκούοντας καὶ νομίζοντας ἱκανοὺς ἔσεσθαι τὰ συμφέροντα διδάσκειν τοὺς πολίτας ἥκιστα γίνεσθαι βιαίους, εἰδότας ὅτι τῇ μὲν βίᾳ πρόσσεστιν ἔχθρα καὶ κίνδυνος, διὰ δὲ τοῦ πείθειν ἀκινδύνως τε καὶ μετὰ φιλίας τὰ αὐτὰ γίγνεται. οἱ μὲν γὰρ βιασθέντες ὡς ἀφαιρέντες μισοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ πεισθέντες ὡς κεχαρισμένοι φιλοῦσιν. οὐκ οὖν οὐ τῶν φρόνησιν ἀσκούων τὸ βιάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἰσχυρὸν ἄνευ γνώμης ἐχόντων τὰ τοιαῦτα πράττειν ἐστίν.

Now it is not here the general parallel and the verbal coinci-

dence only which must be observed, but the plain connecting link between Xenophon's τῶν ἰσχύων ἀνευ γνώμης ἐχόντων and Wisd. xi. 21 τὸ γὰρ μεγάλως ἰσχύειν πάρεστί σοι πάντοτε, καὶ κράτει βραχίονός σου τίς ἀντιστήσεται. Clement (*vid. sup.* p. 111), observe, alters βραχίονός into ἰσχύος, and writes ἢ τις ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, borrowing, as Lightfoot points out, τὸ κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ from Eph. i. 19 or vi. 10. The ἰσχύς of Wisd. xi. 21 thus came very specially under the notice of the writer of Clement's Epistle. If our readers will turn back to p. 111, and observe the connection between Wisdom and Clement's *Ep.* i. 27, which is there pointed out; to p. 132, and the connection there shown between Wisdom and *Diognet.* vii.; to p. 131 sq., and the discussion of Clement's ἀγαθὴ γνώμη,—the conclusion seems to be irresistible that the Greek βία Θεῷ οὐ πρόσσεστιν, ἀγαθὴ δὲ γνώμη πάντοτε συμπάρεστιν αὐτῷ is only a translation of the Latin of Irenæus, in which the translator with singular skill combines the language of Xenophon and the Book of Wisdom. It is easy to understand that a writer with a good memory might attain to great facility in the manufacture of sentences of this character. It is easy also to understand that some men may have found this method of composition very fascinating.

§ 9. The pages of Xenophon from which Stobæus has made his extracts are of special interest and importance, both as regards the composition and the authorship of *Diognetus*. These questions do not immediately concern us. There is one passage, however, which affects both *Peregrinus* and Clement's *Ep.* i., and brings to light so much that is curious that we must not pass it by.

1. In *Mem.* i. 3. 9, Xenophon writes:—

οὐ σὺ Κριτόβουλων ἐνόμιζες . . . καὶ προνοητικῶν μᾶλλον ἢ τῶν ἀνοήτων τε καὶ ῥιψοκινδύνων, and after two lines οὗτος καὶ εἰς μαχαίρας κυβιστήσσει, καὶ εἰς πῦρ ἄλλοιτο, and after one line οὐ γὰρ οὗτος ἐτόλμησε τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδου υἱὸν φιλῆσαι, ὅντα εὐπροσωπότατον καὶ ὠραιότατον; ἀλλ' εἰ μέντοι τοιοῦτον ἐστὶ τὸ ῥιψοκινδύνον ἔργον, καὶ ἐγὼ δοκῶ μοι τὸν κίνδυνον τοῦτον ὑπομεῖναι.

We are here told what Socrates said when he heard that Critobulus had kissed the fair son of Alcibiades, and what Xenophon's reply was. Comp. βλαβὴν γὰρ οὐ τυχοῦσαν, μᾶλλον δὲ κίνδυνον ὑποίσομεν μέγαν, ἐὰν ῥιψοκινδύνως ἐπιδῶμεν

ἐαυτοὺς τοῖς θελήμασιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Clem. *Ep.* i. 14. Observe how the two uses of ῥιψοκίνδυνος are combined in Clement's sentence. With Xenophon's middle sentence, comp. ἢ τί γὰρ ἄλλο . . . χρή ποιῆν . . . ὄρωντας δὲ ἀνδρας γέροντας . . . κυβιστῶνται ἐν τῷ μέσῳ; ὡς δὲ εἰδείητε, οἷόν τε τὸ ἀγαλμά (Proteus) ἐστι τὸ καυθησόμενον κ.τ.λ., *Peregrin.* 8; and also ὡς εἰς πῦρ ἀλέσθαι (obs.), followed after four lines by καὶ τὸ μειράκιον τὸ ὠραῖον, ὃ ἔπεισε κυνίζειν (obs.), ὡς ἔχοι καὶ αὐτός τινα Ἀλκιβιάδην (obs.) . . . ἐν μέσῳ.

The story which Xenophon tells is referred to, and the words which appear to be used in *Peregrinus* are cited, with slight alterations, by Cedrenus, *Compend. Hist.* p. 359 οὗτος, ἔφη, ῥαδίως ἂν καὶ εἰς μαχ. κ.τ.λ. Immediately afterwards Cedrenus says that Agesilaus prevented himself from kissing a beautiful youth, and so escaped βλάβην. Comp. with Clement. Any one interested in Xenophon's εἰς μαχαίρας κυβιστῶν would consult his *Sympos.* ii. 11 μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κύκλος εἰσηνέχθη περίμεστος ξιφῶν ὀρθῶν. εἰς οὖν ταῦτα ἡ ὀρχηστρίς ἐκυβίστα τε καὶ ἐξεκυβίστα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. Comp. the ἐν τῷ μέσῳ of *Peregrin.* §§ 8, 42. Two lines above, observe, Xenophon has ὅτι εἰ ταύτην ὑποίσω, ῥαδίως κ.τ.λ. Comp. the ὑποίσομεν of Clement and the ῥαδίως of Cedrenus. If, indeed, we borrow φιλήματα from Cedrenus, and alter (not a violent alteration) Clement's θελήμασιν into φιλήμασιν, we shall find that Clement conveys the exact idea of Xenophon.

For Clement's οὐ τὴν τυχούσαν we must return to Stobæus. In 94, p. 102, we find οὐ γὰρ τὰν τυχούσαν, ἀλλὰ τὰν μεγίσταν κακοδαίμοσύναν . . . ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαῖς. Compare. A few lines above we observe ἀκέραιον. We have already (p. 110) found this word to be used in § 21, in a passage which has been shown to be connected in language and thought with *Wisdom* xii. and *Diogenes* vii., connected in short with the very subject which brought us to Stobæus. In the same *Sermo* of Stobæus we find various hints for Clement's § 21; for his διὰ τῆς σιγῆς, on p. 104; for his τὸ ἐπεικέες, on p. 87; and for his use of Heb. iv. 12, on p. 88. We must, however, pass these things by, for we have still a great deal to say upon the column of Cedrenus which we have been using.

2. Cedrenus is here very greatly indebted to Theodor. *Græc. Affect. Cur.* xii. *de virtute activa.* p. 1011 (Schulze). Cedrenus

does not follow the order of Theodoretus' remarks, though he adopts a great deal of his language. He adds a good deal from other sources, and partly from those to which Theodoretus himself applied. We shall take up in order the various topics of Cedrenus' column.

At the top, Cedrenus is giving a brief account of Anacharsis, and using the language of Theodoretus, p. 1025. The original source is Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 15,¹ p. 359, but the special statement concerning Anacharsis appears to belong to Plut. ii. p. 505. On p. 506, Plutarch has ἀλλ' ὠμούς ἐσθίεσθαι μᾶλλον, ἢ φράσαι τι τῶν ἀπορρήτων, and on p. 502 τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ στοὰν ἀπὸ μιᾶς φωνῆς πολλὰς ἀντανεκλάσεις ποιοῦσαν, ἐπτάφωνον καλοῦσι, followed presently, on the same page, by καὶ περιπατοῦντες ἐν ταύτῃ θεάσονται προσφοιτῶντα. Comp. ἐσθίαν τῶν ἀπορρήτων αὐτοῖς, *Peregrin.* 16, and ὡς μετὰ τὸ καυθῆναι θεάσαιτο αὐτὸν . . . περιπατοῦντα φαιδρὸν ἐν τῇ ἐπταφώνῳ στοᾷ, *Peregrin.* 40. There is, we believe, no other instance of the use of ἐπτάφωνος.

Cedrenus then speaks of Chiron the centaur, and borrows the language of Theodoretus, p. 1025. The original source is Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 15, p. 360. We observe there ἵνα μὴ κατ' ὄνομα ἐπιὼν διατρίβω. Comp. ἵνα μὴ διατρίβω λέγων, οὕτω διάγοντες κ.τ.λ., *de legend. libr. Gent.* vi. (*vid. sup.* p. 160 sq.). Theodoretus and Cedrenus have διάγειν in the passage founded on Clem. Alex. The subject of pseudo-Basil is very much that of Cedrenus.

Theodoretus proceeds: οὐ τοίνυν μάλα προσήκει θαυμάζειν, οὔτε Ἡσίοδον, τραχεῖαν λέγοντα τῆς ἀρετῆς τὴν ὁδόν, προσάντη, καὶ δύσβατον. Comp. ὅτι τραχεῖα μὲν πρῶτον καὶ δύσβατος . . . καὶ ἀνάντης ὁδός, *de legend. libr. Gent.* iv. This is the sentence that is compared with some lines of Hesiod on p. 164. The more noticeable of the words now given are not in those lines.

Cedrenus then quotes a passage which he prefaces with ὅθεν δὴ Πλάτων ἐναργῶς αὖθις ἐκδιδάσκων φησίν. This passage is found in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. p. 571, also in Theodoretus, p. 1027. In both places the passage appears as ἐν τρίτῳ τῆς Πολιτείας. It is, however, not there. It is the property of

¹ From this page, and out of the passage used, a curious coincidence with *Diognet.* iii. is given in *Church Quarterly*, 1877, p. 60.

Clem. Alex. It contains two or three words only of Plato, and is so marked in Potter's edition of Clement. Seeing that Clement has *ἐναργῶς διδάσκει* not far off, we must conclude that Cedrenus consulted the original source.

The passage in question, which concerns the care of the body, appears to be taken up by pseudo-Basil in *de legend. libr. Gent.* viii. p. 182.

Immediately above this passage, Clem. Alex., who is condemning those who seek death, says: *θανάτω δὲ ἑαυτοὺς ἀποδιδόασιν κένω, καθάπερ καὶ οἱ τῶν Ἰνδῶν Γυμνοσοφισταὶ ματαίῳ πυρί.* These Indian Sophists seem to have excited the deepest interest in the minds of our writers, who appear to have carefully examined almost every account of them to be found in ancient literature. Indications of this are constantly seen in our "group of writings." Calanus was the chief object of attraction and amusement, and the author of *Peregrinus* seems to have taken him in great measure as his model in sketching out the end of Proteus. In well-nigh every place where Calanus is mentioned by the ancients, there or in the immediate neighbourhood we find coincidences with some part or other of *Peregrinus*, and also with other writings. We shall give now a long passage from *Peregrinus*, which contains a reference to Calanus, and we shall give in notes some coincidences from various sources which illustrate it. The coincidences with other parts of *Peregrinus* and with other writings we are compelled to pass by. At the end of this passage from *Peregrinus* we shall give a curious coincidence between it and the third Book of Maccabees, which we wish to have in view for a reason which will hereafter appear:—

§ 24. . . . τὸ τέλος δέ, καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον χρὴ ζηλοῦν, καὶ πυρὰν συνθέντα κορμῶν συκίκων, ὥς ἐνι μάλιστα χλωρῶν, ἐναποπνιγῆναι τῷ καπνῷ. τὸ πῦρ γὰρ αὐτὸ οὐ μόνον Ἡρακλέους, καὶ Ἀσκληπιοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν¹ ἱεροσύλων, καὶ¹ ἀνδροφόνων, οὓς ὁρᾶν ἔστιν ἐκ¹ καταδίκης αὐτὸ πάσχοντας. ὥστε ἄμεινον τὸ διὰ τοῦ καπνοῦ³ ἴδιον γὰρ ὑμῶν μόνων ἂν γένοιτο. § 25. "Ἀλλῶς τε ὁ μὲν Ἡρακλῆς, ἔπερ ἄρα καὶ ἐτόλμησέ τι τοιοῦτον (to cast himself into the fire), ὑπὸ νόσου αὐτὸ ἔδρασεν, ὑπὸ τοῦ Κενταυρίου αἵματος, ὥς φησιν ἡ τραγωδία, κατεσθιόμενος· οὗτος δέ, τίνος αἰτίας ἔνεκεν² ἐμβάλλει² φέρων ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ πῦρ; νῆ Δί',

¹ Diod. xvii. 107, p. 244, ἡξίωσε . . . ἵεναι (in same sentence) . . . οἱ δὲ κενδοξίαν ἐπὶ καρτερίᾳ; and on p. 245, κατεδίκασαν, followed after three lines by πλὴν τῶν ἱεροσύλων καὶ φονέων.

ὅπως τὴν¹ καρτερίαν⁴ ἐπιδείξεται,⁴ καθάπερ οἱ Βραχμᾶνες, ἐκείνοις γὰρ αὐτὸν¹ ἡξίου Θεαγένους εἰκάζειν, ὥσπερ οὐκ¹ ἐνόν, καὶ ἐν Ἰνδοῖς εἶναι τινὰς μωροὺς καὶ¹ κενοδόξους ἀνθρώπους. ὁμως δ' οὖν καὶ ἐκείνους μιμείσθω. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ οὐκ ἐμπηδῶσιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ, ὡς Ὀνησίκριτος ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρου κυβερνήτης, ἰδὼν Κάλανον⁶ καίμενον, φησὶν, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴν² νήσωσι⁵ πλησίον παραστάντες⁴ ἀκίνητοι,⁶ ἀνέχονται παροπτώμενοι, εἴτ'² ἐπιβάντες κατὰ⁵ σχῆμα, καίονται οὐδ' ὅσον ὀλίγον⁶ ἐκτρέψαντες τῆς⁵ κατακλίσεως, *Peregrin.* 25. ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ τοὺς Βραχμᾶνας φασὶ ποιεῖν . . . ἐπειδὴ ἀνήφθη μὲν ἡ πυρά. *Peregrin.* 39.

Ἀπειλήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῖς σκληρότερον ὡς δεδωροκοπημένοις εἰς μηχανὴν τῆς ἐκφυγῆς, συνέβη σαφῶς αὐτὸν περὶ τούτου πεισθῆναι, λεγόντων μετὰ ἀποδείξεως⁷ (obs.), καὶ τὴν χαρτηρίαν (obs.) ἤδη καὶ τοὺς γραφικοὺς καλάμους (obs.) ἐν οἷς ἐχρῶντο ἐκλείπειναι· τοῦτο δὲ ἦν ἐνέργεια τῆς τοῦ βοηθοῦντος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐξ οὐρανοῦ προνοίας ἀνίκητου (obs.), 3 Macc. iv. 19–21; ἀνίκητον, ἀκίνητοις, vi. 13, 19.

² Arrian, *De Exped. Alex.* vii. 3 κελεῦσαι νησθῆναι αὐτῶ πυρὰν . . . τῇ πυρᾷ ἐπιφέροντας . . . ὑπὸ τῆς νόσου . . . ἐμβληθῆναι εἰς τὴν πυρὰν . . . τὸ πῦρ ἐς τὴν πυρὰν ἐνέβαλον . . . οὕτω δὲ ἐπιβάντα τῇ πυρᾷ, κατακλιθῆναι μὲν ἐν κόσμῳ . . . ὅτι ὡς καρτερόν τε ἴσσι καὶ ἀκίνητον κ.τ.λ.

³ *Ælian, Var. Hist.* ii. 12 περὶ τὸν οἶνον ἀκρατῶς ἔχειν. καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρος δὲ ὁ Μακεδὼν ἐπὶ Καλάνῳ . . . καὶ Ἀνάχαρσις δὲ πάμπλου ἐπὶ . . . Σκυθῶν γὰρ ἴδιον τὸ πίνειν ἀκραταν. Comp. with Cedrenus.

⁴ Strabo, xv. p. 686 καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Κάλανος Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τὴν τοιαύτην θίαν ἐπιδείξασμενος. Strabo says nothing more here. In lib. xv. p. 716, we find ἱξάγειν αὐτὸν διὰ πυρὸς νήσαντα πυρὰν, ὑπαλειψάμενον δὲ καὶ καθίσαντα ἐπὶ τὴν πυρὰν ὑφάψαι κελεύειν, ἀκίνητον δὲ καίεσθαι.

⁵ Plut. *Alex.* 69 ταῦτα δ' εἰπὼν, κατακλιθεὶς καὶ συγκαλυφάμενος, οὐκ ἐκινήθη, τοῦ πυρὸς πλησιάζοντος, ἀλλ', ἐν ᾧ κατεκλίθη σχήματι, τοῦτο διατηρῶν, ἐκαλλίερσεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶν νόμῳ τῶν ἐκεῖ σοφιστῶν. Plutarch appears to be indebted to Strabo, xv. pp. 716, 717.

⁶ Luc. *Fug.* 7 τοὺς γυμνοσοφιστὰς λέγεις. ἀκούω γοῦν τά τε ἄλλα περὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ πυρὰν μεγίστην ἀναβάντες ἀνέχονται καίμενοι, οὐδὲν τοῦ σχήματος ἢ τῆς κατῆδρας ἐκτρέποντες. ἀλλ' οὐδὲν μέγα τοῦτο ἔναγχος γοῦν καὶ Ὀλυμπιάσι τὸ ὅμοιον ἐγὼ εἶδον γενόμενον· εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ σὲ παρῆναι, καιρομένου τότε τοῦ γέροντος. There is a plain allusion here to Peregrinus Proteus; and there are several other equally plain allusions to be found in the treatise. Its genuineness is, however, denied by Bourdelot and other critics, and we have therefore made no use of it. It must stand or fall with *de Morte Peregrini*.

⁷ With the four words to which attention is here specially directed, comp. the τὴν καρτερίαν ἐπιδείξεται, Κάλανον, ἀκίνητοις of *Peregrinus*. The difference or alteration in every word is the noticeable part of the coincidence. The ἀνέχονται of *Peregrinus* appears to be a play upon the ἀκίνητοι which immediately precedes, corresponding to the changes made by the writer of 3 Macc. Almost irresistible force is given to the coincidence, from the fact that the χαρτηρία of 3 Macc. is a coinage by the writer, and found in a story which is a self-evident jest. The story is of the "first marvel," which happened when Ptolemy Philopator sought to wreak his vengeance upon the Jews. The king had "ordered the names of the people to be taken down, preparatory to their execution." "The scribes, to whom the task was assigned, toiled for forty days,

Turning to Cedrenus, we find in the sentence preceding the passage copied from Clem. Alex. . . . Κενταύραν, διὰ πολλὴν δῆπουθεν καρτερίαν, and lower down, and immediately after the passage copied from Xen. Mem. i. 3. 9 (*vid. sup.* p. 170), ὁ τοσαύτην δηλονότι πυρὰν ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατατολμήσας ἀνάψαι. Now, observe, the πυρὰν of Cedrenus refers to Xenophon's fire of lustful desire, and the κατατολμήσας is taken from Xenophon's οὐ γὰρ οὗτος, ἔφη, ἐτόλμησε τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδου υἱὸν φιλῆσαι, ὄντα εὐπροσωπότατον καὶ ὠραιότατον; Ἀλλ' εἰ μέντοι, ἔφη ὁ Ξενοφῶν, τοιοῦτόν ἐστι τὸ ῥιψοκίνδυνον ἔργον κ.τ.λ. (*vid. sup.* p. 169). Comp. the εἴπερ ἄρα καὶ ἐτόλμησέ τι τοιοῦτον of *Peregrinus* above. Observe the τοιοῦτον and the parody. In *Peregrinus*, a few lines above the passage quoted, we find οὐ φιλοκινδυνωτέρους καὶ τολμηροτέρους.

Cedrenus goes on to quote a saying ascribed to Diogenes, which is found in Diog. Laert. vi. Shortly afterwards Diog. Laert. gives another saying of Diogenes: ἦν ποτε χρόνος ἐκείνος ὅτ' ἤμην ἐγὼ τοιοῦτος ὁποῖος σὺ νῦν ὁποῖος δ' ἐγὼ νῦν, σὺ οὐδέποτε. This enables us to bring upon the scene another of our "group of writings," for in the *Oratio ad Græcos* (ascribed to Justin Martyr) we observe in § 5 γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι καὶ γὰρ ἤμην ὡς ὑμεῖς (cf. Gal. iv. 12). The saying of Diogenes is expressly referred to by pseudo-Basil in *de legend. libr. Gent.* vii. In the next sentence pseudo-Basil has ὁμοίως αἰσχροὺς ἡγῆσθαι φημι δεῖν τοὺς τοιούτους, ὡς τὸ ἐταιρεῖν ἢ ἄλλοτριῶν γάμοις ἐπιβουλεύειν. In *Orat.* iv. we find εἴποιμι δ' ἂν ὑμῖν ἐτι καὶ τοῦτο· τί ἀγανακτεῖς, Ἑλλήν ὦν, πρὸς τὸ τέκνον σου, εἰ τὸν Δία μιμούμενος ἐπιβουλεύει σοι καὶ ἐπ' ἴσου τὸν γάμον σεσύληκε; In *Peregrinus*, a few lines above the passage which we are

from morning till evening, till at last reeds and paper failed them, and the king's plan was defeated." Smith, *Dict. Bibl.* p. 178. Coincidences with 3 Macc. are found almost everywhere, in the near neighbourhood of the mention of Calanus by the ancients. Thus οὐκ ἔστιν ἀκράτῃ ἀπαντας τοὺς ἐλέφαντας ποτίσαι follow immediately in 3 Macc. Comp. the words from Ælian in note 3. In 3 Macc. vii. 5, appeal is made νόμῳ Σκυθῶν. Arrian, in the place referred to in note 2, says that Alexander, observing the Indian Sophists κρούειν δὲ τοῖς ποσὶ τὴν γῆν, ἐφ' ἧς βεβηκότες ἦσαν, inquired the reason. They replied ἄνθρωπος μὲν ἕκαστος τσόνδε τῆς γῆς κατέχει, ὅσον περ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἐφ' ὅτῃ βεβήκαμεν· σὺ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὦν, παραπλήσιον τοῖς ἄλλοις κ.τ.λ. Comp. τότε οἱ πρὶν ἐπονείδιστοι καὶ πλησίον τοῦ ἄδου, μᾶλλον δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ βεβηκότες, 3 Macc. vi. 31. The passage is very noticeable in Arrian, and the use made of it is clever. The alteration of Arrian's ἐφ' ὅτῃ into ἐπ' αὐτῷ is of the same kind as the alterations of *Peregrinus*.

examining, the writer has ὑμᾶς δ' οὖν αὖθις ἐρήσομαι, δέξαισθ' ἂν ὑμῶν τοὺς παῖδας ζηλωτὰς τοῦ τοιούτου γενέσθαι; οὐκ ἂν εἴποιτε. In Plut. (*de lib. educ.*) ii. 12 we find καὶ νῦν ἂν εἴποιμι, and presently καὶ προηγάγευσε γαμετήν, καὶ τὰ τῶν πατέρων ἐφόδια τοῦ γήρωσ περιέκοφε καὶ σεσύληκε. Comp. with the *Oratio*. In § 8, p. 184, pseudo-Basil has ἐφόδιον πρὸς γῆρας κτησάμενος.

This interlacing of the various members of our "group of writings" one with another is very curious, and seems to suggest either one mind and one hand, or else two or more writers diligently following in one another's steps.

We must pause here for a while to consider what kind of writing the *Oratio* is, which has thus suddenly come into notice. It may very safely be assumed that if it be the work either of Justin Martyr (as some suppose) or of any other early Christian apologist, it will not be found to contain palpable jokes. But the *Oratio* does contain statements and expressions which cannot be regarded otherwise than as jokes. Almost in the first sentence we find the expression ἀπὸ λεπρῶν ποιμένος applied to Paris. The epithets throughout the piece are exceedingly well chosen, and show a thorough acquaintance with the language in which the various mythological subjects handled therein are described by classical authors. The epithet λεπρός applied to Paris seems therefore very strange. Almost in the same sentence we are told that Achilles jumped over a river (ὁ ποταμὸν πηδήσας). It is quite evident, from the author's familiarity with mythology, that he must have known perfectly well that no such leap is recorded in mythological history. In § 3, it is said of Hercules that he jumped over the mountains (ὄρη πηδήσας). On this leap mythological history is also silent. Hercules was a more powerful man than Achilles, and it was fitting that he should have greater jumping powers. But this very fitness of things only helps to make the joke more apparent. In § 3, it is said that Hercules killed the bulls, and the stag which breathed fire through its nostrils, transferring to the stag, that is, the description proper to the bull. In § 2, it is said that Neptune ravished Melanippe as she was fetching water. Here, again, is a matter upon which mythological history is silent. Though these things are so, every line of the first three

sections betrays the hand of one thoroughly versed in ancient mythology. The alterations pointed out must have been deliberately made as jesting "improvements" upon the received myths. They can be nothing else than jokes.

We are in a position, however, to prove this. In *Orat.* i. we are told that Achilles τὰ θεότευκτα ὅπλα ἀποδυσάμενος, νυμφικὴν στολὴν ἐνδυσάμενος, became a victim to love in the temple of Apollo. The writer appears to refer to that version of the death of Achilles which supposes him to have been slain by Paris, on the occasion of his taking Polyxena as his bride into the temple of Apollo. The expression νυμφικὴν στολὴν is capable of two interpretations. It may mean, with Stephens: "vestem qualem sponsæ gerunt," or with Otto: "vestem qualem sponsi gerunt." If the first be accepted, it is obvious to say, with Maran, that Achilles did not put on female attire on that occasion. If we adopt the second interpretation, the expression then becomes an embellishment of the story, which, though not in itself unnatural, acquires importance from the fact that Achilles' assumption of female attire was one of the notable incidents in his career. Stephens, as we shall see presently, refers to Lycophron, and the scholiast, in the pages to which he refers, would prevent him from *unintentionally* so translating νυμφικὴν στολὴν as to make it appear that on the occasion to which the *Oratio* alludes Achilles put on female apparel. It seems, even as the case stands, having in remembrance the other seeming jokes which have been pointed out, almost necessary to believe that the νυμφικὴν στολὴν was deliberately written, that it might give rise to the remarks which have actually been made upon it.

We shall now produce a νυμφικός, over which a like uncertainty may be thought to rest. On p. 50, we had occasion to refer to Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1, in illustration of the τὰ Θύεσταια δεῖπνα of *Orat.* iii. Further on, in the same chapter, Eusebius has ἔμειναν δὲ ἔξω, οἱ μὴδὲ ἴχνος πώποτε πίστεως, μὴδὲ αἰσθησιν ἐνδύματος (comp.) νυμφικοῦ, μὴδὲ ἔννοιαν φόβου Θεοῦ σχόντες. The meaning of νυμφικοῦ here, not only may be, but as a matter of fact has been, disputed. Heinichen has one of his longest notes upon the question whether or not the word is said of Christ, objecting to Valesius' interpretation "*vestis nuptialis*," and pointing to the expressions ὡς νύμφη κεκοσμη-

μένη ἐν κροσσωτοῖς χρυσοῖς περιπεποικιλμένοις, Χριστὸν ἐνδευμένη, used earlier in the same chapter. Now, in the very next sentence, Eusebius says that Alexander, a physician and martyr, was οὐκ ἄμοιρος ἀποστολικοῦ χαρίσματος, while, in the very next sentence of the *Oratio*, Ulysses is said to have been ἀγαθῆς φρονήσεως ἄμοιρος. After three lines we find ταῦτα παιδεύεσθαι οὐ θέλω. Comp. πάντες τοιγαροῦν οἱ νοῦ καὶ φρονήσεως οὐκ ἀμοιροῦντες, ἅτε ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνωτάτω σοφίας παιδεύοντες, Isidor. Pelus. *Ep.* iv. 202.

In *Orat.* v. the writer says:—

Καὶ σοφία¹ ἀπαραμιλλήτῃ κοινωνήσατε, καὶ θείῃ λόγῳ παιδεύθητε, καὶ μάθετε βασιλεία ἄφθαρτον· καὶ τοὺς τούτου ἥρωας ἐπὶ γινώτε οὐποτε λαοῖς φόνον ἐργαζομένους. αὐτοὺς γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ στρατηγὸς οὐ βοῦλεται σωμαμάτων ἀλκὴν καὶ τύπων εὐμορφίαν οὐδ' εὐγενείας φρύαγμα, ἀλλὰ ψυχὴν τε καθαρὰν, ὁσιότητι τετειχισμένην, ἥδη δὲ διηνεκῶς ἐπιστατῶν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς λόγος, καὶ τὰ τοῦ βασιλείως ἡμῶν συνθήματα, πράξεις θείας, ὡς διὰ λόγου δυνάμει εἰς ψυχὴν² διῴκουμένης· ὧ³ σάλπιγξ εἰρηνικὴ ψυχῆς πολεμουμένης, ὧ παθῶν δεινῶν φυγαδευτήριον, ὧ πυρὸς ἐμψύχου σβεστικὸν διδασκάλον!

¹ Comp. ἤσκηντο δ' οὗτοι (ἵπποι) πρὸς εὐμορφίαν (obs.). . . ὡς . . . καὶ ἀπαραμιλλήτον αὐτῶν εἶναι τὴν ἐξύτητα, Joseph. *Antiq.* viii. 7. 3. Josephus speaks also of the appearance and stature of the riders, also of mules surpassing in strength and beauty. Compare. Cureton's translation of the Syriac runs: "Because our Captain delighteth not in the multitude of an army, neither in the horsemen and in their beauty." Comp. with Josephus. It is interesting to notice that an unknown John, "the deacon," a writer of the first half of the 15th century, in some verses in praise of John Palæologus, undertaken at the instigation of an unknown Polycarp, makes a similar use of the same page of Josephus. He says: ὁ Σολομὼν εἰς φρόνησιν μέγας βροτῶν ἐκρίθη | τῶν, ὅσω μᾶλλον τὸ φρονεῖν ἰσχύουσιν, ἀνθρώπων, | ὁ γινώσκων ἀπαραμίλλος κ.τ.λ. He not merely takes the noticeable ἀπαραμ., but other words from Josephus. Comp. e.g. καὶ φρονήσι καὶ πλοῦτῳ διενεγκὼν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἀρχὴν ἰσχυρόταν, οὐκ ἐπέμεινε τούτοις ἄχρι τελευτῆς, with the language of John. It is also worth observing that, a little above, John has καὶ ζῆς ἐν τούτῳ μυστικῶς κατὰ τοὺς Παύλου λόγους, | καὶ μίνεις ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ τούτῳ ἡμφιεσμένος, taking up the οὐκ ἐπέμεινε of Josephus, from whom also he takes the last word exactly. Comp. with discussion of *νυμφικὴν στολήν*.

² Comp. ἡ διῴκουμένη τὸν αἶρα δύναμις, *Clem. Hom.* vi. 10 (there are a number of coincidences between this *Homily* and the beginning and end of the *Oratio*. *Vid. infr.* p. 191); also ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργής . . . καὶ διῴκονόμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς κ.τ.λ., Heb. iv. 12.

³ Comp. ἀλλὰ σάλπιγξ μὲν . . . στρατιώτας συνήγαγεν, καὶ πόλεμον κατήγγειλεν· Χριστὸς δέ, εἰρηνικὸν . . . μέλος . . . σάλπιγξ ἐστὶ Χριστὸς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ . . . ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης κ.τ.λ. . . . τοῦ πονηροῦ ἀποσβέσωμεν (obs.) βίλην . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου Λόγου ἀναζωπυρούμενον . . . ὧ τῆς . . . δυνάμει . . . παραπομπὴς ἀγαθῆ ὁλῃ καὶ τελείῃ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς πνεύματι τοῖς εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀπαίρουσι, γινομένην

Comp. with Isidore. Eusebius in his prefatory remarks upon the chapter which we are using writes ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν ἱστορικὰς ποιούμενοι διηγήσεις, πάντως ἂν παρέδωκαν τῇ γραφῇ πολέμων νίκας, καὶ τρόπαια κατ' ἐχθρῶν, στρατηγῶν τε ἀριστείας, καὶ ὀπλιτῶν ἀνδραγαθίας, αἵματι καὶ μυρίοις φόνοις . . . ὁ δὲ γε τοῦ κατὰ θεὸν πολιτεύματος διηγηματικὸς ἡμῶν λόγος, τοὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τῆς κατὰ ψυχὴν εἰρήνης εἰρηνικωτάτους πολέμους κ.τ.λ. In Eusebius περιρρέων follows after a few lines, and in the *Oratio περιρρέονταν*. As Heinichen remarks, τὸ κατὰ Θεὸν πολίτευμα is here plainly opposed to the preceding στρατηγῶν κ.τ.λ. Comp. It is impossible, one would say, that these things can be accidental.

Let us return for a moment to Eusebius' *νυμφικοῦ* passage. The question there is, whether the *νυμφικὸν ἔνδυμα* is to be referred to the *ἔνδυμα γάμου* of the parable (S. Matt. xxii. 11), with its manifold interpretations, or to the Church as the spouse of Christ, or to Christ Himself, having in mind Rom. xiii. 12–14 ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, καὶ ἐνδυσάμεθα τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός . . . ἀλλ' ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. Comp. with the *Oratio*. We were introduced to the *Oratio* through a certain column of Cedrenus, which is in the closest possible contact with a treatise of Theodoretus. On p. 1027, Theodoretus quotes Rom. xiii. 12 sq., and on p. 1015 he refers to the parable of the ten virgins, and also to that of the wedding garment: καὶ τὰς παρθένους δέ, τὰς ἀρκοῦν οὐκ ἐσχηκυίας τὸ ἔλαιον, ἔξω τοῦ νυμφῶνος κατέλιπε (comp. with Eusebius): καὶ ταῦτα, παρθένους καλῶν καὶ τὸν ἐσθῆτα περιβεβλημένον οὐχ ἀρμόττουσαν γάμῳ . . . ἐξήλασε· καί τινι κληθεὶς εἰσελήλυθεν . . . ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ δὴ . . . οὐκ ἤμειψε τὴν στολὴν (comp.), ἔπαθεν ὥπερ ἔπαθε. Heinichen refers to Theophylact on Rom. xiii. 12. Theophylact, however, is only Chrysostom “writ

. . . μάθε . . . τοῦτο Χριστὸς βούλεται . . . Λόγος ἀφθαρσίας . . . ὁ ἐξελαύνων τὴν φθοράν. Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* 11, p. 90. In the *Oratio* ἐκ γῆς δὲ μετὰγει εἰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ Ὀλυμπον ὄρους, οὕτως ὁ λόγος ἐξ αὐτῶν . . . τὰ δεινὰ . . . ἀπελαύνει πάθη follow directly. From the same page and sentences of Clem. Alex., comp. Λόγος ἀληθείας . . . ἵνα ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἰδρῶσι τὸν Θεόν, with αὐτὸς ἀπ' οὐρανῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὸν λόγον τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἀπερινόητον ἀνθρώποις ἐνίδρυσε, *Diognet.* vii. ; and δι' ἧς (δυνάμει) ἀνθρώποις συμπολιτεύεται Θεός· λώϊον οὖν καὶ ἄμεινον, τῆς ἀρίστης τῶν ὄντων οὐσίας μιμητὴν ὁμοῦ καὶ θεραπευτὴν γίνεσθαι· οὐ γὰρ μιμῆσθαι τις δυνήσεται τὸν Θεόν, with ἀγαπήσας δὲ μιμητῆς ἴση αὐτοῦ τῆς χρηστότητος· καὶ μὴ θαυμάσας εἰ δύναται μιμητῆς ἀνθρώπος γίνεσθαι Θεοῦ . . . οὐδὲ ἐν τούτοις δύναται τις μιμήσασθαι Θεόν . . . Θεὸς ἐν οὐρανοῖς πολιτεύεται, *Diognet.* x.

small," and in Chrysostom (we have had several indications of the use of this writer by our authors, *vid. sup.* pp. 131, 140) we find ἀποδυσώμεθα several times substituted for the ἀποθώμεθα of Romans, also ἔργα ἔλεγεν ὅτε δὲ περὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς, οὐκέτι ἔργα, ἀλλ' ὅπλα, and the way made very plain for the τὰ θεότευκτα ὅπλα ἀποδυσάμενος, νυμφικὴν στολὴν ἐνδυσάμενος of the *Oratio*. Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 4, applies θεότευκτος to the Church which he has just called the "bride." The explanation of ἐνδυμα as applicable to Christ, which Heinichen quotes out of Theophylact, is also given by Chrysostom. On S. Matt. xxii., Chrysostom (*Hom.* lxx.) has οὕτως καὶ σὺ τὸ μὲν σῶμα περιβάλλε στολῇ . . . οὐ λογίζεις πῶς εἰς τὰς παστιάδας τὴν κληθεῖσαν ψυχὴν εἰσεῖναι δεῖ (cf. with Theodor.), κροσσωτοῖς χρυσοῖς περιβεβλημένην πεποικιλμένην; βούλει σοι δεῖξω τοὺς οὕτως ἐστολισμένους; τοὺς ἐνδυμα ἔχοντας γάμου κ.τ.λ. Comp. with the passage from Eusebius. In the next sentence to that containing κροσσωτοῖς κ.τ.λ., Eusebius has οἱ δὲ . . . προσέτι δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὀνειδιζόμενοι ὡς ἀγενεῖς καὶ ἀνανδροὶ, ἀνδροφόνων μὲν ἐγκλημα ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ. Comp. οἱ μὲν θεοὶ ὑμῶν ὑπὸ ἀκрасίας ἡλέγχθησαν, ἀνανδροὶ δὲ οἱ ἥραες, ὑμῶν, ὡς αἱ παρ' ὑμῖν δραματουργοὶ ἱστορίαι ἐδήλωσαν. *Orat.* iii. — giving examples of cruelty.

It is proper to inquire whether *Peregrinus* makes any use of Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1. In § 44, an Alexander (obs.), a physician, plays a rather conspicuous part, and not long before the mention of his name we are told that some of those who had mistaken the hour for Proteus' self-destruction still pressed forward to see the spot καὶ τι λείψανον καταλαμβάνειν τοῦ πυρός. Very soon after the νυμφικοῦ passage, Eusebius has καὶ τότε δὴ προθέντες . . . τάτε τοῦ πυρός λείψανα, πῇ μὲν ἐσπαραγμένα, πῇ δὲ ἠνθρακωμένα κ.τ.λ. In *Peregrin.* 1 we find καὶ νῦν ἐκεῖνος ἀπηνθράκωταί σοι ὁ βελτίστος . . . ὁ δὲ γεννάδας οὗτος τὴν πολυανθρωποτάτην τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν πανηγύρεων τηρήσας . . . ἐπι τοσούτων μαρτύρων (obs.). A few lines above the νυμφικοῦ passage, Eusebius has ἐγγλυκαίνοντος τοῦ τὸν μὲν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ μὴ βουλομένου, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν μετάνοιαν χρηστευομένου Θεοῦ, ἵνα καὶ πάλιν ἐπερωτηθῶσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος· ἐπιστεῖλαιτος γὰρ τοῦ Καίσαρος τοὺς μὲν ἀποτυμπανισθῆναι, εἰ δέ τινες ἀρνοῖτο, τούτους ἀπολυσθῆναι, τῆς ἐνθάδε πανηγύρεως· ἔστι δὲ αὕτη πικρὸς ἀνθρώπος ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν συνερχομένων εἰς αὐτήν.

Compare. With the first part of this passage compare χρῆσ-
 τευσάμεθα αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν εὐσπλαγχρίαν καὶ γλυκύτητα τοῦ
 ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς. Clem. Ep. i. 14. This is very interesting,
 because the preceding words in Clement are those which we
 were commenting upon on p. 170, and which, together with
Peregrinus, appeared to be indebted to Xenophon. The word
 ἀποτυμπανίζειν, which is not very common, is found in the
 pseudo-Helladian excerpts, immediately above the passage
 given on p. 50, and which forms the coincidence with *Orat.* iii.
 The writer says that one Praxiteles skinned a ram alive, and
 was beaten to death because he had invented a new kind of
 torture,—an appropriate story enough, seeing that Eusebius’
 chapter is upon certain martyrs, and the torments which they
 suffered.

The least that can be said upon the foregoing, is that there
 is very good reason for concluding that Eusebius was used in
 the composition of the *Oratio*; and, as a necessary consequence,
 that we are justified in saying that the “leprous shepherd,”
 the two wonderful “leaps,” and the νυμφικὴ στολή of Achilles,
 are merely jests.

We shall now quote so much of *Oratio* iii. as gives the
 account of Hercules. For the consideration of it we must go
 back to *Peregrin.* 25, quoted on p. 172, and to the column of
 Cedrenus which was then in use:—

Τὸν γὰρ τρίςπερον Ἀλκείδην, τῶν ἀγώνων ἡγήτορα, τὸν δι’¹ ἀνδρείαν²
 ἀδόμενον, τὸν τοῦ Διὸς υἱόν, ὃς³ βριαρὸν κατέπεφνε λέοντα καὶ πολύκρανον

¹ The words δι’ ἀνδρείαν are not in the *editio princeps*, published by Stephens in 1592.

² “*Editi ἡγήτορα ἀδόμενον.* Priorem vocem Stephanus (ex msto suo, in quo priores tantum syllabæ exstabant) conjecerat, idemque articulum addi (obs.) posse judicaverat, ut esset ἡγητ. τὸν ἀδόμενον. In codice Argent. nominis ἡγήτορα duæ priores syllabæ et α comparent; sequuntur τὸν (obs.) duo verba, non quidem satis perspicua, sed haud dubie δι’ ἀνδρείαν legenda.” Otto (Jenæ 1849). Since it is most unlikely that two mss. should fail through rough usage or any other cause in the same word and in the same part of the same word, it follows from the above that the ms. which Stephens used was the Cod. Argent. Nearly (perhaps quite) three hundred years after Stephens used the ms. τὸν δι’ ἀνδρείαν could be read. Why did not Stephens print the words?

³ There was an “empty space” here in Stephens’ ms. “Quid si igitur epitheto σθενάρων aut βριαρὸν hoc vacuum spatium esse implendum dicamus,” Steph. notes, p. 75. “Conjecit Stephanus σθενάρων aut βριαρὸν, idque, licet nonnullæ literæ aliquantulum expunctæ sint, codice Argent. probari videtur.” Otto. Here, again, the ms. which Stephens used shows a fault at the same

ᾧλεσεν ὕδραν· ὃν δ' ἄγριον ἀκάματον ὁ νεκρώσας ὕρνιθας δ' ἀνδροβίρους ἵπταμένους καθελεῖν ὁ δυνηθεῖς, καὶ κύνα τρικάρηνον ἐξ ἄδου ἀναγάγων, Αὐγείου δ' ὀχυρὸν τεῖχος σκυβάλων καθελεῖν ὁ δυνηθεῖς, ταύρους δὲ καὶ ἔλαφον ἀνελὼν ὧν μυξωτῆρες ἔπνεον πῦρ, καὶ καρπὸν χρύσειον στελέχους ἔλαβεν, ἐρπετὸν ἰοβόλον ἀνελὼν καὶ Ἀχελῷον, τίνος ἕνεκεν ἔκτανεν οὐ θέμις εἰπεῖν, καὶ τὸν ξενοκτόνον Βούσιριν, καὶ ὕρη πηδῆσας ἵνα λάβῃ ὑδῶρ ἔναρθρον φωνῇν ἀποδιδόν, ὡς λόγος· ὁ δὲ τσαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα καὶ τηλικαῦτα δρᾶσαι (ὁ μὲν Ἡρακλῆς . . . αὐτὸ ἔδρασεν here in *Peregrin.*), δυνηθεῖς, ὡς νήπιος ὑπὸ σατύρων κατακυμβαλισθεὶς καὶ ὑπὸ γυναικείου ἔρωτος ἡττηθεὶς (comp. ὑπὸ γυναικῶν ἡττηθῆναι here in *Cedrenus*) ὑπὸ Λυδῆς γελώσης κατὰ γλουτῶν τυπτόμενος (comp. *Peregrin.* 9, quoted on p. 45, and the τυπτόμενος . . . πυγᾶς of p. 46), ἥδετο· καὶ τέλος (here in *Peregrin.*) τὸν¹ Νέσσειον χιτῶνα ἀποδύσασθαι (story referred to here in *Peregrin.*) μὴ δυνηθεῖς, πυρὰν² κατ' αὐτοῦ (comp. the πυρὰν ἐν ἑαυτῷ of *Cedrenus*), αὐτὸς ποιῆσαι τέλος ἔλαβε τοῦ βίου (*Hercules'* death by fire, here in *Peregrin.*). θέτω τὸν ζῆλον (here in *Peregrin.*) "Ἡφαιστος καὶ μὴ φθονεῖτω εἰ πρεσβύτης ὢν καὶ κυλλὸς τὸν πόδα μεμίσητο," Ἀρης δὲ πεφίλητο νέος ὢν καὶ ὠραῖος (comp. the τὸν Ἀλκ. υἱὸν φιλήσαι, ὄντα εὐπροσ. κ. ὠραιότατον of *Xenophon*, quoted on p. 169).

place where the Cod. Argent. shows one. The argument is the same as in the preceding note. Stephens' ms. must have been the Cod. Argent. But three hundred years after he used it there was no "empty space" at this point. How is this to be explained? There is no room here for the handiwork of the "careless" or "ignorant scribe." Stephens in his note twice uses the expression "vacuum spatium." If he was honest, some one must have filled in the "empty space" with the word *βριαρόν*. The scribe who added the word so as to deceive Cunitz, who collated the ms. for Otto, could, without doubt, if he had been so minded, have written an entire ms. in the style of the 13th century, the supposed date of the Cod. Argent.

¹ "In codd. mstis habetur ἰστίον, sed, ut jam Stephanus vidit, manifesto mendo pro Νέσσειον. Accidit enim ut sequens litera (ν) a præcedente, quæ eadem erat, absorberetur. Scriptor autem intelligit tunicam Nessi Centauri sanguine infectam." Otto. Stephens in his notes gives ἰσσίον. Any way, we have here another plain indication that Stephens' ms. was the Cod. Argent.

² "Hanc præpositionem, quam conjecit Stephanus, Cod. Argent. confirmavit." Otto. So then κατ' was in the ms. before him, and, as before in the case of *βριαρόν*, he saw nothing. Beurer is supposed, on the testimony of Stephens, to have transcribed the ms. which Stephens used. The readings of this supposed transcript by Beurer are given by Sylburg. "Aberat (κατ') a Beureri apographo." Otto. In § 4, Otto has καὶ ἐπ' ἴσου. Stephens printed and translated καὶ σοῦ. "Apog. Beur. (obs.) et Cod. Argent. καὶ ἐπὶ σοῦ." Otto. In § 5, Stephens printed καὶ τούτους τοὺς ἥρωας, and conjectured τούτου. Otto prints τοὺς τούτου, and says that this reading "exstat in apographo Beur. (obs.) et in codice Argent." In the next line Otto prints ὁ στρατηγός (*vid. sup.* p. 177). Stephens writes: "In exempl. videntur superesse quædam vestigia vocis στρατηγός, articulo ὁ ei præfixo." Three hundred years afterwards the ms. it seems was more easily deciphered, for Otto says of ὁ στρατηγός, "ope codicis Argent. suo loco restitui."

NOTE.—It is quite evident from the footnotes that the ms. which Stephens used was the Cod. Argent., and equally evident that he used the ms. dishonestly. Some persons seem to imagine that Stephens had access to some other ms. He says, however, expressly in his preface, that he had only one. The comparison of Stephens' text of the *Epistola ad Diognetum*, and his notes thereon, with the readings of the Cod. Argent., wholly confirms the view we have been taking. See *Church Quarterly*, April 1877, pp. 69, 70; also an able discussion of the question in *Patr. Apost. Op.*, Lipsiæ 1875, pp. 208, 209. It may be well to hear what Otto's judgment upon Stephens would be, if he could bring himself to believe, as he cannot, that Stephens' ms. was the Cod. Argent. In reply to Bunsen, he writes: "At vero neutiquam argumentis opinionem firmavit: juxta quam Stephanus hercle nequissimus foret verbero, utpote qui sæpenu-mero 1°. antiquo codici suo disertissime imputaret lacunas, ubi Argenteratensis primâ manu perspicue voces illic deficientes præbet, 2°. lectiones ex suo codice memoraret, quæ valde differunt a lectionibus in Argenteratensi clarissime primâ manu exhibitis. Quid plura? Constat Stephanum mendaciis tam impudentibus decepisse neminem." *Athenag. Op.*, Jenæ 1857, p. 327. It is, however, more reasonable to believe that Stephens' was dishonest, than that two mss. again and again failed from natural causes in exactly the same places. We quite admit that there may have been another ms. which perhaps Beurer used. But if there were two mss., one of them was a fraudulent imitation of the other.

It is difficult to suppose that the connection, pointed out above, of the *Oratio* with the various writings which happened to be in our hands, on p. 174 sq., has accidentally arisen. As it is of importance to discover the meaning of this, we shall devote some space to the examination of the passage which contains it.

In the article on *Ep. ad Diognet.* in the *Church Quarterly*, April 1877, p. 47, there is a prefatory note upon the name "Diognetus." It is there shown that two persons of this name—the one (p. 149) a prophet, the other (p. 151) a pugilist—are mentioned in Phot. *Bibl.* 190, and that there are circumstances which seem to indicate that Stephens had in view, in his notes on the *Oratio*, that part of Cod. 190 which speaks of Diognetus the pugilist. This prefatory note was intended to supply a base of operations for the examination of the *Oratio*, and as such we shall now use it.

The circumstances referred to are briefly these. Stephens in

his note on "the leprous shepherd" of *Orat.* i., takes occasion to say that the emendation of λεπροῦ into Λεπραίου, if it should occur to any one, *cannot* be made with reference to the Lepreum known to geographers. In his note on the "vacuum spatium" of *Orat.* iii., he says that the gap *cannot* be filled by Νεμεαῖον, for reasons which he gives. In his note on the marvellous "leap" of Achilles, he says that the leap *cannot* be the well-nigh proverbial one of which Lycophron speaks. It happens that in Cod. 190, a few lines after the mention of Diognetus the pugilist, the town of Lepreum is mentioned. Previously the writer has spoken of the Nemean lion, grafting, as his custom is, new circumstances on to an old myth. Shortly after the mention of Lepreum, a line of Lycophron is quoted, which brings in a discussion of the epithet ποδάρκης as applied to Achilles. These things seem to indicate that Stephens had Cod. 190 in his mind when he was writing his notes on the earlier part of the *Oratio*. At any rate, it is a very curious circumstance that these things should be found all close together, in near company with the name of Diognetus, the name, that is, of the person to whom the epistle was written, of which possibly the world would never have known anything whatever if it had not been for Stephens.

Our first coincidence is close at hand. The epithet ποδάρκης is applied to Achilles a few times in Homer; *e.g.* πάντα γὰρ κατέπεφνε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. The word κατέπεφνε follows the "vacuum spatium" in *Orat.* iii., quoted above.

Let us turn now to p. 151, where Diognetus and Lepreum are mentioned, and see what we can find.

The eye falls at once upon ὅτι φλυαρῶν οὗτος ὁ μυθογράφος (Ptolemy) Μωσῆς, φησίν, ὁ τῶν Ἑβραίων νομιθέτης ἄλφα ἐκαλείτο διὰ τὸ ἀλφoῦς ἔχειν ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος, and presently καὶ ἡ Κυψέλου δὲ μήτηρ, χαλὴ οὔσα, Λάμβδα ἐκλήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Πυθίου. The pseudo-Helladian excerpts, Phot. *Bibl.* 279, begin thus: ὅτι φλυαρεῖ καὶ οὗτος τὸν Μωσὴν ἄλφα καλεῖσθαι διότι ἀλφoῖς τὸ σῶμα κατὰστικτος ἦν, and on p. 531 we find ὅτι τοῦ βασιλέως Κορίνθου ἡ μήτηρ . . . κολοβωτέρῳ σκάζουσα τῷ ἑτέρῳ ποδί, Λάβδα ἐκαλείτο, quoted on p. 63, in connection with the *Evang. Thom.* Comp. these together, and with each the ὦν καὶ κυλλὸς τὸν πόδα of the *Oratio*. For νομιθέτης we may refer back to p. 58. Our readers are there directed to certain

so-called excerpts from Diodorus. The particular excerpts made use of speak of the Israelites as having been driven from Egypt because of their leprosy, an accusation which is repelled by Theophilus in *Autol.* i. 9. Theophilus calls them "shepherds." It cannot be denied, then, that we have here in close company with Lepreum an excellent illustration of the "leprous shepherd" of the *Oratio*. Sylburg, we may remark, defended the expression, and referred in justification of it to Theophilus.

We shall now take a passage from Cod. 190, of 17 lines. It contains the mention of Lepreum. Just above it is the name of Diognetus, just below it the reference to Moses, who may be called, in the view of Ptolemy and the writer of the pseudo-Helladian excerpts, "the leprous shepherd" of the Hebrews :—

Καὶ ὡς Μενέδημος Ἡλεῖτος Βουνέα υἱὸν ὑπέδειξεν Ἡρακλεῖ περὶ τῆς καθάρσεως τοῦ Αὐγέου κόπρου, ὥστε ἀποστρέψαι τὸν ποταμόν. . . ἐν Λεπρίῳ . . . ἀγῶνα δὲ θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτῷ Ἡρακλῆς ἐπάλαισε Θησεῖ ἰσοπαλοῦς δὲ τοῦ ἀγῶνος γενομένου ἐβῆθη παρὰ τῶν θεατῶν περὶ τοῦ Θησεῖος Ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς. Ὅτι Φαντασία . . . συνέταξε πρὸ Ὀμήρου τὸν Ἰλιακὸν πόλεμον . . . τὰ μὲν ἀνδρεῖα . . . τὰ θηλυκὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.

A few lines above this passage the writer has τὰ δ' Ἔργα καὶ τὰς Ἡμέρας Ἡσιόδου.

In *Orat.* ii. the author has ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ Ἡσιόδος μεθ' Ὀμηρον Ἔργα τε καὶ Ἡμέρας συνέγραψε. Comp. with the words given from Cod. 190, and note the πρὸ Ὀμήρου. The words of the *Oratio* are made more noticeable, from the circumstance that Stephens desired to write ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ Ἡσ. μεθ' Ὀμ. ἐγένετο (or ἦν) ὅς Ἔργα κ.τ.λ. Otto improves on it. He says: "Quid? Fortasse legendum: Ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ Ἡσιόδος ἦν, ὅς μεθ' Ὀμ. Ἔργα, etc.—ita ut erroris causa sit repetitum ΟΣ." It may be possible to find the suggestion for this ὅς. The town of Lepreum is not very often mentioned by the ancients. Aristophanes speaks of it in the following lines: *ὅτι νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς, ὅς οὐκ ἰδὼν βδελύττομαι τὸν Λέπρεον ἀπὸ Μελανθίου, Av.* 150, 151. Some difficulty has been felt as to ὅς here, and ὅς οὐκ and ὡς οὐκ have been in consequence suggested. The scholiast says *πλεονάζει δὲ τὸ ΟΣ*. He says also that Melanthius was *λεπρός*, and that the explanation of the name Lepreum must be referred to leprosy. We can understand,

then, the source from which the suggestion for the dropped $\delta\varsigma$ came, and also how Stephens was led to speak of $\Lambda\epsilon\pi\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ as a possible substitute for $\lambda\epsilon\pi\rho\omicron\upsilon$ in *Orat.* i. The coincidence between the words of *Orat.* ii. and Cod. 190 must be borne in mind. Comp. also the $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ Μελανθίου ($\lambda\epsilon\pi\rho\omicron\upsilon$) with the $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ $\lambda\epsilon\pi\rho\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ of the *Oratio*.

At the close of *Orat.* ii., a few lines above the passage quoted on p. 180, we observe $\tau\omicron$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\iota\kappa\omicron\acute{\nu}$, and $\tau\omicron$ $\theta\eta\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omicron\acute{\nu}$, and also $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\omicron\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\kappa\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$. Comp. with the words from Cod. 190, quoted above. On p. 152, the author has $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\omicron\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\kappa\upsilon\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$.

Next, comp. with the passage from Cod. 190 the Αύγειου δ' $\omicron\chi\upsilon\rho\omicron\acute{\nu}$ $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ $\sigma\kappa\upsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\omicron$ $\delta\upsilon\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ of the passage from the *Oratio*, quoted above. Otto translates, and no doubt rightly, “qui Augiæ validum stercorum murum *destruere* potuit.” Stephens, however, translated otherwise: “qui Augiæ validum murum *purgare* stercoribus potuit.” So Sylburg “deceptus Stephani versione,” as Otto says, “ $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ pro $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ dictum esse notat.” Stephens’ translation agrees with the coincidence which we have just produced out of the passage which contains the mention of the Lepreum to which Stephens refers. There are several indications in Stephens’ edition of the *Oratio* and *Ep. ad Diognet.*, that the text, the translation, and the notes have each as it were an independent history. So here Stephens seems to be translating something which was in his mind rather than actually before him. We venture to point out what appears to us to be the solution of the discrepancy between Stephens’ text and Stephens’ translation. Just before the $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in question is another $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. It would be obvious to suggest that the scribe of “the very ancient exemplar” which Stephens used had had his eye caught by the first $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, and so been led to substitute it for the following $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$. With this theory the Greek text agrees, so also does the translation, but the corresponding note was omitted. There is a very similar omission from Stephens’ note on the close of *Diognet.* viii.

Comp. also the $\tau\omicron\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\acute{\nu}\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\acute{\eta}\gamma\acute{\eta}\tau\omicron\rho\alpha$ of *Orat.* iii., quoted above, with the passage from Cod. 190. The Theseus spoken of is said to have been the founder of the Isthmian games. In connection with Theseus a Menedemus is mentioned. Plutarch

(ii. p. 81) ascribes to another Menedemus a somewhat noticeable saying: καταπλεῖν γὰρ ἔφη τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπὶ σχολὴν Ἀθήναζε σοφοὺς τὸ πρῶτον, εἶτα γενέσθαι φιλοσόφους, εἶτα ῥήτορας, τοῦ δὲ χρόνου προϊόντας, ἰδιώτας. Clement in *Ep.* ii. 7 deals with the Isthmian games, and he says: καὶ ὅτι εἰς τοὺς φθαρτοὺς ἀγῶνας καταπλέουσιν πολλοί, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες στεφανοῦνται . . . ἀγῶνα τὸν ἄφθαρτον, καὶ πολλοὶ εἰς αὐτὸν καταπλεύσασιν . . . καὶ εἰ μὴ δυνάμεθα πάντες στεφανωθῆναι, κἂν ἐγγὺς τοῦ στεφάνου γενώμεθα. It is said of Diognetus (the Cretan pugilist) νικήσας οὐ λάβει τὸν στέφανον . . . τοῦτον τὸν Διόγνητον ὡς ἥρωα Κρήτες τιμῶσιν.

So far we have been concerned only with a few lines of Cod. 190, specially marked out for us by the coincidences with the pseudo-Helladian excerpts, and by the knowledge which Stephens would seem to have had of them.

If, however, we look backward we find several other coincidences. In *Orat.* i. we have πρῶτιστα μὲν γὰρ φασι τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα, τῇ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἀκρασίᾳ . . . τὴν θυγατέρα πρὸς θυσίαν εὐδοκήσαντα δοῦναι . . . ἵνα ῥύσῃται τὴν Ἑλένην ἀπὸ λεπροῦ ποιμένος ἥρπασμένην. The story is told here in Cod. 190, p. 151, with a noticeable variation. We find ἀδελφός . . . ὡς Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀρπάζοντος Ἑλένην Μενέλαος . . . χρᾶ Κάλχας λυθῆναι τὸ δεινόν, εἰ θύσειε τὴν θυγατέρα Ἰφιγένειαν Ἀγαμέμνων Ποσειδῶνι. τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἀνασχομένου, ὀργισθέντες οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀφείλοντο αὐτοῦ τὸ κράτος, καὶ κατέστησαν βασιλέα Παλαμῆδην. Comp. εὐδοκήσαντα. The truth—if we may use the word of a myth—being that Agamemnon at first rebelled, but afterwards yielded to the entreaties of Menelaus.

Still looking back, we find on p. 150 that the author gives an explanation of the origin of the saying: "The Cretans are always liars." Have we here the reason why Diognetus, who was a Cretan, is taken as the title of the epistle? Three lines above we observe περιέθηκε στεφάνῳ. In *Orat.* iv. we have στεφάνων περιθέσεις.

On p. 149, we find τὴν ἐν Ἰσῳ μάχην. Did this suggest the corrupt reading τὸν ἑσσίον (*vid. sup.* p. 181, note)?

On p. 148, the writer has τίνος ἐστὶν ὁ ὕμνος ὁ ἀδόκιμος ἐν Θηβαίοις εἰς Ἥρακλέα, ἐν ᾧ λέγει Διὸς καὶ Ἥρας υἱός. Comp. the τὸν δι' ἀνδρείαν ἀδόκιμον τὸν τοῦ Διὸς υἱόν of *Orat.* iii., quoted on p. 180.

A few lines above, on the same page, we find ὡς Δημήτηρ πενθοῦσα τὴν θυγατέρα, ἐπεὶ Ποσειδῶν αὐτὴν ἐν κατηφείᾳ οὔσαν ἐπείρα, εἰς ἵππον ἑαυτὴν μετεμόρφωσε χαλεπήνασα, ἐλθοῦσα δ' ἐπὶ τὴν πηγὴν καὶ θεασαμένη τὴν μορφὴν ἐστύγχε τε καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ μέλαν ἐποίησε. Comp. καὶ ἡ Δήμητρα, ἀλαμένη κατὰ τὰς ἐρήμους, τὸ τέκνον ἐζήτει, and after one line πάλιν ὁ Ποσειδῶν Μελανίππην μὲν ἥσχυεν ὑδρευομένην. Neither the one nor the other of these acts of Neptune appears to be recorded in mythical history. There was a Melanippe queen of the Amazons, θαυμαζομένη μάλιστα δι' ἀνδρείαν (Diod. iv. 16, p. 262), whose life Hercules preserved. Comp. the δι' ἀνδρείαν which belongs to the coincidence which we just pointed out with this very place of Cod. 190.

On p. 147, the writer has ἀνελών τὸν . . . πυρίπνοον Γίγαντα. Comp. ταύρους δὲ καὶ ἔλαφον ἀνελών ὧν μυξωτῆρες ἔπνεον πῦρ, *Orat.* iii., quoted above. Sylburg complained of the inappropriateness of the description, and wished to transpose the words ταύρους and ἔλαφον. The complaint may be thought to apply equally to the Γίγαντα. We shall have more to say on this hereafter.

Just above the writer makes a swarm of locusts to go up from the funeral pyre of Hercules. The writer of *Peregrinus* makes a vulture to fly up from the funeral pyre of Proteus.

On p. 146, the writer speaks of the end of Hercules ὡς πυρὶ αὐτὸν ἀνείλε μὴ δυνηθεῖς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἐκτεῖναι τόξον. Similarly, the writer of the *Oratio*, in the passage quoted on p. 180, gives a μὴ δυνηθείς as the cause of Hercules' death. There the similarity ends, and it is this which gives weight to the coincidences. Obs. in the *Oratio* the twice repeated ὁ δυνηθείς which precedes.

Lastly, in his preliminary remarks on Ptolemy, Photius writes ἔχει γὰρ δοῦναι συνειλεγμένα βραχεῖ χρόνῳ εἰδέναι, ἃ σποράδην τις τῶν βιβλίων ἀναλέγειν πόνον δεδεγμένος μακρὸν κατατρίψει βίον, and after two lines ὁ μέντοι τούτων συναγωγὴς κ.τ.λ. Comp. *Orat.* ii., where it is said that Neptune debauched so many women besides Melanippe, that in the mere mentioning of their names πολὺ πλῆθος λόγων κατατρίβομεν. Comp., further, κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην διαβεβόηται καὶ ὕμνηται· καὶ τὰ περὶ τούτων σποράδην κείμενα ἀποφθέγματα ἡνθολόγηται from the second *Preface* to the *Sacr. Par.* of John

of Damascus (*vid. sup.* p. 157, and the parallels there given). Comp. also, with both, the εἶτα ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα διεβεβόητο . . . ἄλλη ἄλλοτε ἀμείβαν . . . ἐν βραχεῖ παῖδας αὐτοὺς ἀπέφηνε . . . καὶ ξυναγωγεύς . . . καὶ τῶν βίβλων τὰς μὲν ἐξηγεῖτο, καὶ διεσάφει, πολλὰς δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ξυνέγραφε. *Peregrin.* 10, quoted on p. 47, remembering the υἱοὺς . . . ἀπεφῆνατο of the first *Preface* to the *Sacr. Par.* From the same passage of *Perigrinus*, comp. ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα . . . ἃ δὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔδρασε . . . φυγὴν ἑαυτοῦ καταδικάσας with the ὁ τὰ τοσαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα καὶ τηλικαῦτα δρᾶσαι in the passage from the *Oratio* now in hand, quoted on p. 181, and τὸν κατὰ πατραλῶν νόμον καὶ τὸ μοιχείας πρόστιμον, a few lines above that passage, in *Orat.* ii. In *Peregrin.* 21, we find εἴ γε χρὴ καὶ τοὺς πατραλοίας, καὶ τοὺς ἀθέους δίκας διδόναι τῶν τολμημάτων.

If we turn to the page of Diodorus (p. 262) from which a moment ago we produced δι' ἀνδρείαν, we observe διεβεβόητο (the exact word of *Peregrinus*) γὰρ καθ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην. Comp. with the passage just given from the second *Preface* *Sacr. Par.*

On p. 263, Diodorus has ἀνεῖλε Βούσιριν τὸν βασιλέα, ξινοκτονοῦντα τοὺς παρεπιδημοῦντας. Comp. *Orat.* iii. (quoted on p. 181) ἀνελὼν καὶ . . . καὶ τὸν ξινοκτόνον Βούσιριν.

Diodorus goes on, p. 264, to speak of the Ἡρακλέους στηλῶν, and the conflicting testimony concerning them:—

Βουλόμενος δὲ ἀείμνηστον ἔργον ἐπ' αὐτῷ συντελέσαι, φασί, τὰς ἄκρας ἀμφοτέρως ἐπὶ πολὺ προσχῶσαι . . . ἅμα δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἔργων μένῃ ἀείμνηστος ἡ δόξα τοῦ κατασκευάσαντος ὥς δὲ τινες φασί, τοῦναντίον τῶν ἡπείρων ἀμφοτέρων συνεξευγμένων, διασκάψαι ταύτας, καὶ τὸν πόρον ἀνοίξαντα, ποιῆσαι τὸν ὠκεανὸν μίσγεσθαι τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς θαλάττῃ. Diodorus says that Hercules did two other things of the same kind. The country around Tempe had been marsh for many a long day, but Hercules drained it (obs.) and turned it into one of the most glorious plains in Thessaly. A large district of Bæotia, on the other hand, he laid under water. Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν Θεσσαλίαν ἔπραξεν εὐεργετῶν τοὺς Ἕλληνας, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Βοιωτίαν τιμωρίαν λαμβάνων κ.τ.λ.

We have here before us the source of certain jokes found in some of our writings.

The writer of *Peregrinus* informs us in § 19 that Proteus reviled Herodes (*vid. sup.* p. 31) Atticus, concerning whom it is said ἄνδρα παιδεία καὶ ἀξιώματι προὔχοντα, διότι καὶ ἐν

τοῖς ἄλλοις εὖ ἐποίησε τὴν Ἑλλάδα (comp. with the words of Diodorus just given), καὶ ὕδωρ ἐπήγαγε τῇ Ὀλυμπίᾳ, καὶ ἔπαυσε δίψει ἀπολλυμένους τοὺς πανηγυριστάς, κακῶς ἡγόρευεν ὡς καταθελύσαντα τοὺς Ἕλληνας, δέον τοὺς θεατάς τῶν Ὀλυμπίων διακαρτερεῖν διψῶντας, καὶ νῆ Δία γε καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν πολλοὺς αὐτῶν ὑπὸ σφοδρῶν τῶν νόσων, αἱ τέως διὰ τὸ ξηρὸν τοῦ χωρίου ἐν πολλῷ τῷ πλήθει ἐπεπόλαζον.

On p. 259, Diodorus says (of the Stymphalian birds) ἐπέπολασε γὰρ ὀρνίθων πλῆθος ἀμύθητον, and presently on the same page (of the cleansing of the Augean stables) ἐπαγαγῶν δὲ τὸν . . . ποταμὸν ἐπὶ τὴν αὐλήν. Compare.

The first few words of *Peregrin.* 19, just given, have been already under our notice, as supplying a coincidence with pseudo-Galen (*vid. sup.* p. 80). Comp. with them now, *Orat.* i., τῷ γὰρ ἐν παιδείᾳ παρ' ὑμῖν προὔχοντα (of Homer), and after two lines καὶ πᾶσαν ταράξαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

We have also pointed out on p. 37 a coincidence between *Peregrin.* 19 (above) and Philostratus' life of Herodes Atticus. In *Vit. Soph.* ii. 13, it is said that Proteus κακῶς ἡγόρευεν Herodes.

Herodes was the counterpart of Proteus in his thirst for human applause, in the charge brought against him of murder, and in some other particulars. They did not, however, use the same methods to obtain the renown which they desired. The one narrative is as much a satire as the other, but that told in *De Morte Peregrini* is the more extravagant of the two.

The circumstance to which the author of *Peregrinus* refers, in the passage given above, is found in *Vit. Soph.* ii. 5 ἀνέθηκε δὲ . . . καὶ τῷ Διὶ τὸ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ὕδωρ. Θετταλοῖς (so Hercules) τε, καὶ τοῖς περὶ Μηλίδα κόλπον Ἕλλησι, τὰς ἐν Θερμοπύλαις κολυμβήθρας, τοῖς νοσοῦσι (comp. with *Peregrinus*) παιωνέιους. Superior to Hercules, ὤννησε . . . καὶ Βοιωτίᾳ πόλεις. He built theatres, and was in some sort emulous of the great deeds of his great namesake of New Testament notoriety (Joseph. *Antiq.* xv. 9 sq.). He set up statues and τὸν ἱερὸν ἐνέπλησεν with them, showing himself superior to him (whose name must never be mentioned) who ἐνέπρησε (obs.) τῆς Ἐφεσίας Ἀρτέμιδος τὸν νεών. . . . τοσοῦτος ἔρωσ τῆς δόξης ἐντέτηκεν αὐτῷ (*Peregrin.* 22).

Philostratus goes on: καὶ τοσοῦτος (obs.) ὥν μεγαλουργία

(Joseph. *Antiq.* xv. 9, a rare word), μέγα οὐδὲν εἰργάσθαι ᾤετο, ἐπεὶ μὴ τὸν Ἰσθμὸν (Corinth) ἔτεμε· λαμπρὸν ἡγούμενος, ἥπειρον ἀποτεμεῖν, καὶ πελάγη συνάψαι διττά. In reply to a question Herodes said ἐγὼ πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ἀγωνίζομαι, σημῶν ὑπολιπέσθαι τοῖς μετ' ἐμὲ ἀνθρώποις διανοίας, δηλοῦσης ἀνδρα· καὶ οὕτω δοκῶ μοι τῆς δόξης (obs.) ταύτης τυγχάνειν. He put aside the attempt of his friend to magnify his great works, saying, φθαρτὰ λέγεις ταῦτα, καὶ γάρ ἐστι χρόνος ἄλωτά (comp. οἰώμεθα ὅτι βέλτιόν ἐστιν τὰ ἐνθάδε μισῆσαι, ὅτι μικρὰ καὶ ὀλιγοχρόνια καὶ φθαρτά. Clem. *Ep.* ii. 6), καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἡμῶν τοιχαρχοῦσιν ἕτεροι, ὁ μὲν τὸ μεμφόμενος, ὁ δὲ τό· ἡ δὲ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ τομὴ ἔργον ἀθάνατον, καὶ ἀπιστούμενον τῇ φύσει. δοκεῖ γάρ μοι τὸ ῥῆξαι τὸν Ἰσθμὸν Ποσειδῶνος δεῖσθαι, ἢ ἀνδρός, ὃν ἐκάλουν οἱ πολλοὶ Ἡρώδου Ἡρακλέα (obs.). Comp. here throughout with the language of Diodorus given above. The parody cannot be mistaken. With the closing lines, compare also ταῦτα ἀνθρώπου οὐ δοκεῖ τὰ ἔργα, ταῦτα δυνάμεις ἐστὶ θεοῦ· ταῦτα τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ δείγματα, *Diognet.* vii., the last words of the section on which so much has been said on p. 132 sq.

We have already referred several times (pp. 89, 148) to the so-called excerpts from Diodorus, found in Phot. *Bibl.* 244, and in particular to the accounts which are there given of the *hermaphrodite*. These accounts are two in number, and the special jest of each of them is founded on the words of Herodes Atticus, which have just been given. In both accounts the seeming woman is changed into a man; in both there is an inflammatory swelling. In the one, however, the change is effected by the application of medicaments which produce a ῥῆξιν (comp. with Herodes) τῆς ἐπιφανείας; in the other, the surgeon ἔτεμε (comp. with Herodes) τὸν ἐπηρμένον τόπον. The description in this second case is more detailed than in the first. The writer proceeds: τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον τὸ αἰδοῖον ἄκρον ἐπιτεμῶν συνέτρησεν εἰς τὸν οὐρητήρα, καὶ καθεῖς ἀργυροῦν καυλίσκον ταύτῃ τὰ περιττώματα τῶν ὑγρῶν ἐξεκόμενιζε (for the idea, comp. with Diodorus) τὸν δὲ σεσυριγγαμένον τόπον ἐλκώσας ἐνέφυσεν. It is strange that it should ever have been thought possible for Photius to have stained his pages with such filth, or for Diodorus to have manufactured such elaborate falsehoods.

The parody pointed out seems hardly a doubtful matter, even as the case stands. We shall have occasion to return to Cod. 244, and then the conjecture will be supported by other evidence.

The use of Cod. 190 in the *Oratio* will, we should suppose, be conceded. This concession seems, however, almost necessarily to carry with it an acknowledgment that Stephens had perfect knowledge of the fact, for his notes upon the *Oratio* seem to show that he had Cod. 190 in his mind when he was writing them. We can understand, therefore, now why he did not translate *τεῖχος σκυβάλων καθελεῖν*, but something else which was in his mind. His back-handed suggestion of Lepreum, connected as it is with leprosy, both in Cod. 190 and elsewhere, is also explained. Stephens in fact adopts the *Oratio* as his own property, enters into its jokes, and has jokes of his own. Of a piece with this is his handling of his "ancient exemplar." We do not say that he wrote the *Oratio*, we have no evidence on that point at present. But we say that he deliberately put it forth as an ancient writing, well knowing that it was nothing of the kind. The views of literary honesty were far less strict in Stephens' day than in our own times, consequently the charge we bring against him loses something of its gravity. Still the charge is a grave one, and we are bound to show sufficiently those facts which seem to us to justify the charge. We shall therefore make a few further remarks upon the *Oratio*, which could not well have been made before.

As we have already seen on p. 189, the writer in *Orat.* i. refers to Homer. He proceeds *πρώτιστα μὲν γὰρ φασι τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα . . . καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα πρὸς θυσίαν εὐδοκήσαντα δοῦναι . . . καὶ πᾶσαν ταραῖσαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἵνα ῥύσῃται τὴν Ἑλένην ἀπὸ λεπροῦ ποιμένος ἥρπασμένην*. Stephens in his notes professes to "suspect" *λεπροῦ*, and accedes to the conjecture of I. Casaubon, *ἀπ' ὀλέθρου ποιμένος*, with the alteration of *ἀπό* into *ὑπό*. We said (p. 177) that there are a number of coincidences between Clem. *Hom.* vi. and the *Oratio*, and we pointed out one. In § 2, the writer of the *Homily* maintains that the ancient myths are allegories. He names a number of these, concluding with that of Paris and Helen, and adds *οὐ γὰρ ἂν τῇ τῆς θεᾶς τίμῃ πρόφασις ἐγίνετο παμφύλου*

(obs.) πολέμου, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τοῦ τὴν τιμὴν ἀπειληφότος καὶ ἀγχιστεύοντες τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης γένει. Was the conjecture of Casaubon suggested from this source? The *Homily* goes on immediately to speak of ἐν σοφίᾳ τὸν μέγιστον Ὅμηρον (comp.), quoting *Il.* vii. 99, and adding ὡς ἐκείθεν ἀπάντων τὴν γένεσιν ἐσχηκότων, καὶ μετ' ἀνάλυσιν τῆς ὑγρᾶς καὶ γῆϊνης οὐσίας εἰς τὴν πρώτην πάλιν ἀποκαθισταμένων φύσιν, ὃ ἐστι χάος. Ἡσίοδος δὲ ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ λέγει· Ἦτοι μὲν πρώτιστα χάος ἐγένετο· Τὸ δὲ ἐγένετο δηλονότι . . . οὐ τὸ αἰεῖ εἶναι κ.τ.λ. Comp. the "Homer" and πρώτιστα with *Orat.* i., quoted above. The concluding words of the *Oratio* are παραλυθῆσα (obs.) δὲ (ἢ ψυχῇ) περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῆς κακῶν περιρρέοντων ἀπέρχεται πρὸς τὸν ποιήσαντα (obs.) αὐτήν· δεῖ γὰρ ἀποκατασταθῆναι ὅθεν ἀπέστη, ὅθεν τις ἐγένετο ἢ ἐστιν. Compare. The last words, so Otto thinks, have the appearance of being a gloss.

The expression ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ has, however, a special interest, in that it appears to be taken from Eurip. *Iphig. Aul.* 884–886 ΚΛ. ὁ δὲ γάμος τίν' εἶχε πρόφασιν (obs.), ἥ μ' ἐκόμισεν ἐκ δόμων; ΠΡ. ἴν' ἀγάγοις χαίρουσ' Ἀχιλλεῖ παῖδα νυμφεύσουσα σὴν. ΚΛ. ὦ θύγατερ, ἥκεις ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ καὶ σὺ καὶ μήτηρ σέθεν. In line 1237, ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ is applied by Iphigenia to herself, and she says ὅμμια δὸς φίλημά τε, ἴν' ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κατθανοῦς' ἔχω σέθεν (Agamemnon) μνημεῖον. The words immediately preceding the passage from *Orat.* i., just quoted, are λύσσης καὶ ἀκρασίας ἐστὶ μνημεῖα going on to instance Agamemnon. In line 1378 sq., Iphigenia again uses the word ὄλεθρος, applying it now to Helen: εἰς ἔμ' Ἑλλάς (obs.) ἡ μεγίστη πᾶσα (obs.) νῦν ἀποβλέπει . . . μηκέθ' ἀρπάζειν ἑᾶν τάσδ' ὀλβίας ἐξ Ἑλλάδος, | τὸν Ἑλένης τίσαντας ὄλεθρον (obs.), ἦντιν' ἤρπασεν (obs.) Πάρις. | ταῦτα πάντα κατθανοῦσα ῥύσομαι (obs.) καί μου κλέος, | Ἑλλάδ' ὡς ἡλευθέρωσα, μακάριον γενήσεται. Comp. with *Oratio*. Here again, in line 1398, we find ταῦτα γὰρ μνημεῖά μου.

It seems necessary to conclude from the foregoing coincidences, first with the Clementine *Homily* then with Euripides, that ὄλεθρου cannot be regarded simply in the light of a conjecture, but as an actual part of the text of the *Oratio*. In Stephens' notes upon *Diognetus* there are several instances of conjectures of the same kind too apt to be accidental. There is one—but not the most striking amongst them—in his notes

on § 1, compared with a passage from Hippolytus (*Church Quarterly*, April 1877, p. 52).

We shall now call two witnesses to prove the use of this passage of Euripides.

We have shown on p. 189 a coincidence between *Peregrinus* and the *Oratio* at the very spot where we have been examining the latter writing. In *Peregrin.* 33 (*vid. sup.* p. 32), Proteus is supposed to have reached the final act of self-sacrifice. He has been recounting the story of his life, and urging on men to follow in his steps, to undergo all hardships for the sake of philosophy, and to despise death. When he ceased speaking, the more foolish among his hearers wept, and exclaimed σώζου τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. The braver sort, however, cried τέλει τὰ δεδογμένα to the great dismay of Proteus. Now, in Euripides, in line 1375—we have just quoted 1378—Iphigenia says κατθανεῖν μὲν μοι δέδοκται. In line 1415, Achilles says ἄχθομαί τ', ἴστω Θέτις, εἰ μὴ σε σώσω Δαναΐδαισι κ.τ.λ. Iphigenia replies ἔα δὲ σῶσαί μ' Ἑλλάδ', ἣν δυνάμεθα. Very soon afterwards, in *Peregrinus*, we observe ἀποβλέπων ἐς . . . Comp. with the εἰς . . . ἀποβλέπει of line 1378, quoted above, and which seems to be partly used in the *Oratio*. In one particular, then, the death of Proteus seems to be a parody of the sacrifice of Iphigenia.

We will now find some parodies in what professes to be a very grave document.

In *Ep.* i. 55, Clement—we use the word simply as a designation of the writer of the epistles which bear Clement's name—says:—

πολλοὶ βασιλεῖς . . . χρησιμοδοτηθέντες παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς θάνατον, ἵνα ῥύσωνται (obs.) διὰ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν αἵματος τοὺς πολίτας . . . Ἰουδὴ ἡ μακαρία (obs.) . . . καὶ ἡ τελεία κατὰ πίστιν Ἑσθὴρ κινδύνῳ ἑαυτῇ παρέβαλεν, ἵνα τὸ δωδεκάφυλον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μέλλον ἀπολίσθαι (obs.) ῥύσεται.

Comp. the ἵνα ῥύσεται ἀπ' ὀλέθρου in the *Oratio*, as amended by I. Casaubon in Stephens' note. Comp. the μακαρία with Euripides, and observe the general parallel which the story of Iphigenia presents. Iphigenia appeared just now in *Peregrinus* as Peregrinus himself; here, in Clement, still more like Proteus, she is first "many kings," then "Judith," and lastly "Esther," for the μακαρία applied to Judith may be thought to be a

reference to the "*celebrem historiam*," as Stephens would say (*vid. sup.* p. 16), of Iphigenia.

In the passage quoted above, Iphigenia applies the word κλέος to herself. The word appears in Clement, in a remarkable sentence, only four or five lines above the first words quoted from § 55. He says τοῦτο ὁ ποιήσας ἑαυτῷ μέγα κλέος ἐν Χριστῷ περιποιήσεται, καὶ πᾶς τόπος δέξεται αὐτόν. We may remember that μέγα κλέος has been found (*vid. sup.* p. 151) in the second *Preface Sacr. Par.*, and shown to have been taken from Diod. iv. 7, p. 253 διὰ τὸ τὸν ἐκ τῆς ποιήσεως τῶν ἐγκωμιαζομένων ἔπαινον μέγα κλέος περιποιεῖν τοῖς ἐπαινουμένοις. Compare. Is this coincidence accidental? Consider how it has been found. What can be plainer than that the κλέος of the line of Euripides—which itself supplies a parallel to Clement's words—suggested the language of Diodorus?

The μέγα κλέος of the *Preface* is applied to the holy fathers, whose great renown, the writer says, is celebrated throughout the whole world. This suggests to us Clement's § 5, where the labours of S. Peter and also of S. Paul are described. The writer says κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, τὸ γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος (obs.) ἔλαβεν, δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας κ.τ.λ. Lightfoot and others maintain that Clement here alludes to S. Paul's visit to Spain (*vid. Appendix*). If we refer to Glycas, *Annal.* iii. p. 236, we find S. Paul's visit to Spain mentioned. Glycas tells us only one thing concerning it. He says that a certain woman, being desirous to see the apostle, and to hear the truth from his own lips, urged her husband to take him as their guest. The woman's eyes were straightway opened, and she read, in golden letters upon the apostle's forehead, Παῦλος ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κήρυξ. Compare. A little above on the same page some words of Chrysostom are quoted: ποῖος τόπος τὸ σὸν (S. Paul) ἐδέξατο αἷμα κ.τ.λ. Comp. with the words from § 55. Above again, but on the preceding page, we find a number of authorities mentioned who declare that the Apostles Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom at the same time. How well these pages illustrate Clement, may be judged from the circumstance that the authorities whom Glycas names Lightfoot also names in his note on p. 46.

But now another singular fact appears, for the sake of which these coincidences have been given. We observe here in Glycas a dozen lines or so which are very nearly the same as those in the place of Cedrenus which we have already used so much, and on which we have still a good deal to say. If we turn to Cedrenus, we find that, if Glycas had copied (if this is the true statement of the connection) only two lines more, he would have told us that Chiron the centaur was a *δικαιοσύνης διδάσκαλον*. Comp. Clement's *δικαιοσύνην διδάξας*. Apparently this is another allusion to a "*celebrem historiam*."

We return to Euripides, and in line 1407 we find Iphigenia saying *δίδωμι σῶμα τοῦμὸν Ἑλλάδι*. These words would necessarily suggest to any one on the look-out for such resemblances 1 Cor. xiii. 3 *καὶ ἐὰν ψωμίσω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου, καὶ ἐὰν παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα καυθήσωμαι*. Accordingly we find in § 55 amongst the very words from which we quoted just now, and in which we found the coincidences with the *Oratio* and Euripides, *πολλοὶ ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν* (obs.) *εἰς δουλείαν, καὶ λαβόντες τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῶν ἑτέρους ἐψώμισαν* (obs.). In the passage from *Orat.* iii., quoted on p. 181, we may observe a reference to Omphale and her contemptuous treatment (as of a child) of Hercules, who had been sold to her as a slave. We found just now some of Clement's language in Diod. iv. 7, p. 253. The history of Hercules begins on that page, and is followed out in detail. In c. 31, p. 276, Diodorus gives the account of Hercules and Omphale without the contemptuous treatment which Lucian, however, supplies. Hercules being afflicted with a disease applied to Apollo, and he was told that his disease would be healed *εἰ πραθεῖς δικαίως τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τιμὴν ἀποδοίη τοῖς Ἰφίτου παισίν*. Hercules yielded *καὶ δοῦλος ἐγένετο Ὀμφάλῃς . . . καὶ τὴν μὲν τιμὴν . . . παισὶν ἀπέδωκε κατὰ τὸν χρησμόν. . . καὶ δουλεύων τῇ Ὀμφάλῃ κ.τ.λ.* Comp. with Clement. Thus here the story of Hercules would seem to have been pressed into Clement's service.

It is difficult, indeed impossible, to gauge the amount of resistance which coincidences such as these will have to meet. Still, when these which we have just now been producing are added to the vast array of coincidences with Clement which have been previously brought forward, we cannot understand how, with any show of reason, the authorship of Clement,

bishop of Rome, can be maintained. We shall, at any rate, now venture plainly to express the opinion that neither the one nor the other of the two epistles bearing Clement's name was written by him.

We think also that it must be now conceded that I. Casaubon's emendation (ἀπ' ὀλέθρου) is something more than a conjecture. It must not be supposed that we are suggesting that Casaubon was guilty of fraud in this matter. We do not think that the conjecture originally came from him. He may possibly have approved of it. Certainly nothing would have pleased him better than to appear with a mark of approbation in the note of his learned father-in-law. And nothing, we may add, would have pleased Stephens (or perhaps any one of his literary friends) more than to pass off a piece of spurious Greek upon one so learned as his son-in-law Casaubon. It is at any rate most strange that Casaubon's judgment should have been sought on this point, and, so far as can be gathered from the silence of Stephens' notes, on this point alone out of the many in the *Oratio* and *Diognetus* which required some elucidation. Then, again, Stephens certainly was not usually backward in making conjectures, and it does seem curious that he should have nothing of his own to offer beyond the change of Casaubon's ἀπό into ὑπό. Stephens' suggestion partly destroys the coincidence. A plain proof of innocence! One cannot but think that Stephens fathered the ἀπ' ὀλέθρου upon Casaubon with a sly chuckle at his expense. We are disposed to think that Sylburg's too appropriate defence of λεπροῦ comes in truth from the same source. While sending the transcripts to Sylburg it would be natural for Stephens to comment upon such a passage as the "leprous shepherd," and nothing would be easier than to make the suggestion of the reference to Theophilus (*vid. sup.* p. 184), in such a way that Sylburg could take it up as his own. Stephens' other suggestion (Λεπραίου), which again he is careful not to adopt as his own, seems to confirm the view we take of his conduct. What critic would seriously suggest an epithet so inappropriate to Paris? But as we have already said, it is quite conceivable that he might make the suggestion as a joke.

This view seems, however, to be further confirmed by his dealings with another corrupt passage, and which is found in

Orat. ii. The writer says ὁ γὰρ μεγαλάνυμος ὑμῶν ὁ Λητοῖδης (Tatian) ὁ μαντικὴν (Tatian) ἐπαγγειλάμενος, ἑαυτὸν ἤλεγξεν (Tatian) ὅτι ψεύδεται. Δάφνην ἐδίωκεν, ἣν οὐ κατέλαβε· καὶ τῷ ἐρομένῳ αὐτὸν Αἰακίδῃ σκευαντὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον οὐκ ἐμαντεύσατο. Both Theophilus (*Autol.* i. 9) and Tatian (c. 8) put Daphne and Hyacinth side by side as illustrations of Apollo's prophetic ignorance. The special mark of connection pointed out above seems to show that Hyacinth was in the mind of the writer of the *Oratio*. In *Deor. Dial.* xvi., Lucian laughs at Apollo, and says αὐτὸς γοῦν ὁ μάντις ἡγνῶει, ὅτι (obs.) φονεύσαι μὲν τὸν ἐράμενον (obs.) τῷ δίσκῳ, οὐ προεμαντεύσατο (obs.) δέ, ὥς φεύζεται αὐτὸν Δάφνη κ.τ.λ. In the next line but one we observe ξινοκτόνος, used in *Orat.* iii. quoted on p. 181. In *Deor. Dial.* xiv. 2, Apollo, who is describing the death of Hyacinth, says δισκεύειν ἐμάνθανε, καὶ γὰρ συνεδίσκευον αὐτῷ; Philostratus (*Imag.* xiv.) has αἰνίττεται ὁ ζωγράφος τὴν ἀπώλειαν τοῦ μεираκίου· δισκεύονται δὲ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι πλάγιος ἐμπνεύσας, ἐμβάλλει τῷ Ὑακίνθῳ τὸν δίσκον. The suggestion to amend the text of the *Oratio* by the use of the word δισκεύειν (Αἰακίδῃ σκευαντὶ) can hardly be called a conjecture, while the passages before us suggest more restorations of the text than one which would plausibly explain the cause of the corruption. It is interesting to see how Stephens, who in his edition of Plato (*vid. sup.* p. 13) distinguished himself by his apt corrections of the "mistakes of copyists and typographers," and by his "very felicitous," though, as some think, occasionally "dishonest" "improvements" of the text, dealt with this corrupt (!) passage of the *Oratio*. No one was more familiar with Lucian than Stephens. Some portions of Tatian's treatise he published along with the *Oratio*. He had the wisdom of Beurer and of Casaubon to assist him, and yet he writes "Scripsi σκευαντὶ absque accentu, quod sit vocabulum depravatum: de quo alienam divinationem expectabo," p. 75. This note seems to let us entirely behind the scenes. It explains Stephens' conduct throughout. It tells us that he sought to mystify his learned contemporaries, to amuse himself with their failures to enter into his jokes, and to chuckle over their grave conjectures on passages, the true history of which he knew perfectly well. Stephens' hands are not clean. Some charge must be brought against him. We may be quite sure

that he would have infinitely preferred to be thought capable of a scholarly deception, than of inability to see the true character of the *Oratio*, or to correct its corrupt passages.

This "corrupt" passage has an apt parallel in Clem. *Ep.* i. 6 διὰ ζῆλος διαρχεῖσθαι γυναῖκες, Δαναῖδες καὶ Δίρκαι, αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια παθοῦσαι . . . καὶ ἔλαβον γέρας γενναῖον οἱ ἀσθενεῖς τῷ σώματι. The reading Δαν. κ. Διρ., which has been thought to be corrupt, and which has been altered by Wordsworth into νεάνιδες παιδίσκαι, is confirmed by the later MSS. and also by *Strom.* iv. 19, p. 618, where Clem. Alex. mentions the Danaids only a very few lines after what has been supposed to be a quotation from Clement's *Ep.* i. 55. The passage supposed to be cited is that from which we were quoting just now in connection with Euripides. The coincidences which we then showed are not in Clem. Alex., and seem to be additions. When the passage was in our hands before, we pointed out a certain relation between it and § 5. This is an evident suggestion to consult the play of Euripides which we were then using. Accordingly, in line 613 sq., we find a corruption which has called forth much criticism σὺ δ', ὦ τέκνον μοι, λείπει πωλικούς ὄχρους, | ἄβρὸν τιθεῖσα κῶλον, ἀσθενές θ' ἅμα (obs.). | ὑμεῖς δὲ νεανίδαισιν (obs.) ἀγκάλαις ἐπί. Comp. the ἀσθενές θ' ἅμα with the οἱ ἀσθενεῖς τῷ σώματι of Clement, and notice the position of the words in the respective sentences. Our writer's mind seems to turn to Euseb. v. 1 (lately in hand in the *νυμφικὴν στολὴν* discussion) διὰ τὸ ἀσθενές τοῦ σώματος ἡ Βλανδίνα, or more exactly, further on, ἀσθενής τῷ σώματι; and very naturally, for the story of Blandina is an apt illustration of that of Dirce. Euripides, line 1200, σφάγιον παρασχέειν Δαναΐδαισι παῖδα σὴν, was perhaps useful.

It is idle to consider what the true reading ought to be, since none other was ever written than that which now stands in Clement's text, but we can find what perhaps may be thought to be a confirmation of the notion that νεάνιδες was in the writer's mind. In *Ep. ad Theoph.* 24, we are told of the troubles which had come through the neglect (of course) of the sacred images, and we find αἰχμαλωσίαι λαῶν ὥσει πρόβατα εἰς σφαγὴν πορευόμενα, μέχρις Αἰθίοπων, καὶ Ἰνδῶν, καὶ εἰς Ἀνατολὰς γῆς δοῦλοι καὶ αἰχμάλωτοι, νεάνιδες καὶ παρθένοι κ.τ.λ. Clement has, as we have already seen (p. 194), ἐν τε τῇ

ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει . . . ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως a few lines above in § 5. In the words of *Theophilus* we observe a reference to Isa. liii. The last line of § 5 runs thus: ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός. The last word is found in 1 Pet. ii. 21, where it is applied to the lesson of patience to be learned from the sufferings of Christ. In § 16, Clement uses the word immediately after his quotation of Isa. liii., and to which he applies it.

We not only find these things in *Theophilus*, but also what may well be thought to be a glance at the story of Hyacinth. In § 28, the writer speaks of Theodosius. He takes three stories found in Cedrenus, and making one out of them, says, that the king being in dread of his enemies, applied to a holy man, who sent him a monk's dress (some articles of this appear as articles of women's attire in pseud.-Athanasius, *De Virgin.* 11), καὶ ταῦτα ἐνδυσάμενος (obs. with *Oratio*), he got on horseback. Accompanied by an angelic host, also on horseback, the king went against his enemies, and completely defeated them. The writer then says, "Search and see—τὰς ἱεράς ἐνδυτὰς καὶ τὰ ἱερά σκεύη," going on to narrate how a certain person trampled on τὸν ἱερόν δίσκον. Comp. the corrupt passage of the *Oratio* with its probable emendations. The writer adds, at the end of the story, ἡστόχησε τῆς ἀξίας, θανάτῳ ἁλώρῳ δύσθητος γεγονώς, which sufficiently points out the joke. The writer, while he appears to take the staple of his story about Theodosius from Cedrenus, and also to use 2 Macc. xi., seems also to have in view the scholiast's (on Lycophron) account of Achilles' assumption of female attire, and to work it all up into a sort of parody. Any way, the joke on Hyacinth and the δίσκος is not at all doubtful.

We can, moreover, show that Clement's Epistle, in the section which has been shown to be indebted to Euripides, is connected with the very part of *Theophilus* which we have just been using. *Ep.* i. 55 contains the words παρέδωκεν Κύριος . . . ἐν χειρὶ κ.τ.λ. The first words of § 56 are καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐντύχωμεν περὶ τῶν ἐν τινὶ παραπτώματι κ.τ.λ. Almost immediately LXX. Ps. cxvii. 18 is quoted. In *Theophilus*, just above the story to which we have been referring, the writer has ἐὰν εὖρω, φησὶν, ἱερέα ἢ μοναχὸν ἐν τινὶ παραπτώματι, ἐγὼ αὐτός τὴν χλαμύδα μου ἤπλωσα ἂν καὶ ἐσκέπαζον αὐτόν,

which tells its own jesting tale. Just above this again, the writer has ἔδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρί σου ὁ . . . Κύριος, and quotes LXX. Ps. cxvii. 16.

§ 10. Having now ascertained the true character of the *Oratio*, which suddenly became mixed up with the coincidences which we were finding for *Peregrinus* and other writings, we return to the column of Cedrenus on which we were before engaged. We have in our hands this column (vol. i. col. 397, Migne), Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 8 sq., a passage from *Peregrinus* quoted on p. 172, a passage from the *Oratio* given on p. 180, and the *Græc. Affect. cur.* xii. *de virt. act.* of Theodoretus from which Cedrenus borrows.

1. On p. 185, a coincidence between the *Oratio* and Phot. *Bibl.* 190, p. 152, is pointed out. Just above this coincidence, in Cod. 190, Achilles is described as ὁ Χείρωνος διδάσκαλος; almost immediately afterwards we observe the words πάλλος ἀμύχανον. Cedrenus calls Chiron δικαιοσύνης διδάσκαλος. In connection with these words a coincidence of a singular kind with Clement has been shown on p. 195. Cedrenus is indebted not merely to Theodoretus, but also to Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 15, p. 360, and there Chiron is described as the instructor of Achilles. The writer of Cod. 190 reverses this; he is indulging in the jocular perversions and embellishments of ancient myths in which he so much delights. Further down in the same column, Cedrenus applies the expression πάλλος ἀμύχανον to Pantheia. Plutarch (ii. 31) tells the story of Cyrus' refusal to see Pantheia, and precedes it by the account of Agesilaus' conduct to a boy. Accordingly Cedrenus refers to this (*vid. sup.* p. 170). In ii. p. 521, Plutarch again refers to Pantheia, and there connects with her story that of the behaviour of Alexander¹ to the wife and daughters of Darius. Accordingly Cedrenus links these two stories together. This last narrative is given also by pseudo-Basil, *de legend libr. Gent.* 5, p. 179, nearly in Cedrenus' words. The context shows that pseudo-Basil is not merely copying from the same source as Cedrenus, not to mention that his language is partly

¹ It was from observing the interest which our writers appeared to take in this matter of history that we were induced to examine Diodorus' narrative in *lib.* xvii. 31, p. 182 sq. For the use made by Clement and others of Diodorus' pages, *vid. sup.* pp. 74, 88, also *vid. inf.* Appendix A.

that of Cedrenus in his account of Pantheia. The two accounts cannot be independent of one another. Which of the two writers is the copyist? We have here one of those significant coincidences for which it is necessary to make the most diligent search if we would get at the bottom of the mystery which lies before us. Pseudo-Basil goes on to use the words *συμβῆναι τοῖς ἡμετέροις*, and presently *τῶν μαθημάτων ἃ τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν τρέφει, μηδὲνα λόγον ἔχειν, ἀλλ' . . . ἐμβάλλεσθαι. καίτοι τίνα ἔχει λόγον κυβερνήτην*, and after one line *τοξότην*. (Comp. here *ὁ γλυκύτης τῶν . . . μαθημάτων αὐξάνουσα καὶ τρέφουσα τὰς ψυχάς*, second *Pref. Sacr. Par.*) Cedrenus has *συμπεφάνηκε . . . τοῖς ἡμετέροις* in one sentence, and in the next *αὖξιν δὲ τὸ πάθος ἐλπίς, τρέφει δὲ μνήμη*. This confirms the opinion that pseudo-Basil and Cedrenus are not independent of one another. Cedrenus, however, is copying *word for word* from Theodoretus, p. 1028. Unless, therefore, pseudo-Basil was the writer of the page which bears Cedrenus' name, which is probable enough, he must have copied from Cedrenus. *Peregrinus*, in the passage quoted on p. 172, has *ἐμβάλλει φέρων . . . κυβερνήτης*. Xenophon has, as we shall see directly, a very noticeable *τοξότης*.

Cedrenus speaks not only of the refusal of Cyrus to see Pantheia, but also of the reason which Cyrus gave for that refusal: *τὸ μὲν γὰρ πῦρ, φησί, τοὺς πλησίον πάντη ἐστῶτας καίει, τὸ δὲ κάλλος καὶ τοὺς πόρρωθεν ἐστῶτας*. This sentence is made up by Cedrenus partly out of *Xen. Cyrop.* v. 5, and partly out of *Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 13 (part of the passage which we are using) *ἴσως δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἑρωτες τοξόται* (obs.) *διὰ τοῦτο καλοῦνται, ὅτι καὶ πόρρωθεν οἱ καλοὶ τιτρώσκουσιν*. These words are, it must be observed, supposed by some critics to be an interpolation.¹ We shall return to this passage presently.

We have now exhausted the subjects taken up in the column

¹ We omitted to point out in the proper place (p. 163) that the lines of Epicharmus, which precede Xenophon's description of the "choice of Hercules," are thought by some editors to be an interpolation, on the ground that in the words *καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ δὲ τόπῳ φησίν*, with which the second line of Epicharmus is introduced, a meaning must be given to *τόπος* which it had not in Xenophon's day. It happens that in *Clem. Ep.* i. 8, the section which has been shown to be connected with Xenophon, and which contains the manufactured apocryphal quotation, the writer introduces *Isa. i. 16-20* with *καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει*.

of Cedrenus,¹ which has been under review. The account of Anacharsis, found on the top of this column, is preceded by a mention of the Brahmins (*Peregrinus*, quoted on p. 173), and of the Hyperboreans, who are described as living beyond the Rhipæan mountains. We cannot have a better guide than Stephens as to the direction in which a student of his times, or earlier, would look for information as to these fabled mountains. In his *Thesaurus* he refers us to "Dionys. *de Situ Orbis*, p. 51, editionis patris mei." Dionysius does not say much, but his scholiast Eustathius tells us all that was supposed to be known concerning them. Just above his account, on p. 52 ("editionis patris mei"), Eustathius has the following sentence:—

‘Ηρόδοτος δὲ οὐ μόνον Γελωνὸν καὶ Ἀγάθυρσον υἱοὺς Ἑρακλέος λέγει, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σκύθην νεώτατον καὶ γενναιότατον, οὗς ἐγέννησεν Ἑρακλῆς ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν τῶν Σκυθῶν γῆν, ὅτε τὰς Γηρυόνου βοῦς ἤλαυνε, μιγείς, φησὶν, ἐχίδνη μιξοπαρθένῳ, γυναικὸς μὲν τὰ ἄνω ὑπὸ γλουτῶν (obs.) ἐχούσῃ, τὰ δὲ κάτω, ὅφειας (τὰ δὲ ἔνερθεν, ὅφιος, Herod. iv. 9).

Comp. ὑπὸ γυναικείου ἔρωτος ἡττηθεὶς (Cedrenus) ὑπὸ Λυδῆς γελώσης κατὰ γλουτῶν (obs.) τυπτόμενος, *Orat.* iii., quoted on p. 181. This laughing Lydian lady's name was Omphale. We believe the γλουτῶν of the *Oratio* to be taken from Eustathius.

For τυπτόμενος we have on p. 181 referred to Arist. *Nub.* 959 sq., τυπτόμενος πολλὰς (πληγὰς δηλονότι. *Schol.*) ὡς τὰς Μούσας ἀφανίζων. ἐν παιδοτρίβου (εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου γυμνάζονται, καὶ διατρίβουσιν οἱ παῖδες. *Schol.*) κ.τ.λ. On p. 46, it is shown that the πολλὰς πληγὰς ἔλαβε of *Peregrin.* 9 is taken from this source. Comp. also pseudo-Basil, *de legend. libr. Gent.* 6 πολλὰς δὲ πληγὰς ἐν παιδοτρίβου λαβόντες . . . παρὰ τῶν γυμναστῶν . . . ἵνα μὴ διατρίβω λέγων (*vid. sup.* p. 171). Now, observe, *Nub.* 964 runs: ἡλείψατο δ' ἂν τοῦμυραλοῦ (obs.) οὐδεὶς παῖς ὑπένερθεν (obs.) τοτ' ἄν. Comp. with the *Oratio*, Eustathius and Herodotus. Aristophanes perhaps suggested Eustathius.

If there is a joke on foot, we may be pretty sure that the

¹ We did not stumble upon these out-of-the-way pages accidentally. We were guided straight to them by a reference in a fifteenth century writing, very closely connected with *Diognetus*. References to Cedrenus' *Compend. Hist.* appear to be exceedingly rare.

Epistola ad Theophilum will have some share in it. A few lines above the passage from *Peregrinus* (now in our hands, *vid. sup.* p. 172) is the word *πανευδαίμων*. It is used once by Plutarch, two or three times by Lucian, but otherwise does not appear to be common. In *Theoph.* xvi. p. 638, there is the following passage:—

... τῶν ἱεραρχῶν . . . διαγόντων ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι, οὐκ οἷδ' ὅπως εἶπεῖν, τέρας ξενοφανές (apparently an unknown word) εἰσέδου εἰς τὴν πανευδαίμονα (obs.) πόλιν· γοναϊκός τινος τῶν ἐγχωρίων τετοκυίας βρέφος, τὰ μὲν ἄνω μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἕως τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ (obs.) εἶχε πάντα παῖδος, τὰ δὲ ὑποκάτω, θηρῶν ἀγρίων κ.τ.λ.

This *may* be taken from the myth which Eustathius gives concerning Hercules out of Herodotus. We imagine that there is some jesting lying in the background. At any rate, we can produce a very curious corroboration of our conjecture as to the connection between the passage given from Eustathius and the sentence of the *Oratio* which refers to the Lydian Omphale.

2. Justin the Gnostic introduced into his ravings a great many heathen myths—selecting apparently the most scandalous among them—which he allegorized after his own fashion. Coincidences between Hippol. *Ref.* v. 26, where Justin's teaching is explained, and Diodorus' account of Priapus (in which Clem. *Ep.* i. 59 is not altogether unconcerned) have been pointed out, p. 153 sq. The narrative of the life of Hercules is another of the mythical stories of which Justin made use, and in *Ref.* x. 15, p. 516, the following passage is found:—

ἡ (δὲ) θήλεια . . . τὰ μὲν ἄνω αὐτῆς μέχρι βουβῶνος εἶναι παρθένον, ἀπὸ δὲ βουβῶνος τὰ κάτω ἔχιδναν. καλεῖται δὲ ἡ τοιαύτη Ἐδέμ καὶ Ἰσραήλ. ταύτας φάσκει ἀρχὰς εἶναι τῶν ὄλων, ἀφ' ὧν τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. τὸν Ἐλωείμ δὲ ἀπρογνώστως ἐλθεῖν (obs.) εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς μιζοπαρθένου, καὶ ἐπιμιγέντα (obs.) γεννησά (obs.) ἀγγέλους δώδεκα.

The language is curiously like that of Eustathius (*vid. sup.* p. 202). Now, observe, we presently find (on same page) ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα φάσκει προφήτην γεγονέναι, ἡττηθῆναι (obs.) δὲ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῆς Ὀμφάλης (obs.) τουτέστιν ὑπὸ τῆς Βάβελ, ἣν Ἀφροδίτην ὀνομάζουσιν. Comp. with the *Oratio*. *Ref.* x. is an epitome of the preceding books. In *Ref.* v. 25, the myth concerning Echidna, here referred to, is more fully told. It is drawn, as Hippolytus tells us, from Herodotus.

Hercules, it appears, was driving the oxen of Geryones, and came to Scythia. He lost his horses (τὰς ἵππους), and in the course of his wanderings in search of them came upon Echidna in a cave. In answer to his inquiry, Echidna told him that she had got his horses, but that she would not give them up πρὶν ἢ οἱ μυχθῆναι.

This reminds us of Plut. 155 sq. (*vid. sup.* p. 54), where Aristophanes says that the boys sometimes asked for a horse as payment for their iniquity. The parallelism is, however, more pointed in Hippolytus, for Justin changes the τὰς ἵππους of Herodotus into τὸν ἵππον, and says that Hercules λαβὼν δὲ τούτου μισθὸν τὸν ἵππον παρὰ τῆς θηριάδου κόρης, ἀπὸ πηλλάττετο φέρων (obs.) καὶ τὰς βοῦς. We shall have occasion to refer to this presently in connection with the same line of Aristophanes. It naturally occurs to one to ask whether these are really ancient Gnostic ravings or scholarly jokes of more modern times? Nothing is known of Justin beyond what Hippolytus tells us. The only MS. of *Ref.* iv.-x. is very far from being ancient, and the opinion that these books are of late date, manufactured in great part out of Irenæus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, etc., is quite admissible.¹ We do not intend to do more at the present time than point out a few things which lie close at hand, which at any rate cast great doubt upon the antiquity of them.

¹ "And is there not something striking and congenial [to the character of the year 1851] in the history of the discovery? A French scholar, and a statesman of high merit, M. Villemain, sent a Greek to Mount Athos to look out for new treasures in the domain of Greek literature. The fruits of this mission were deposited, in 1842, in the great national library, already possessed of so many treasures. Among them was a manuscript of no great antiquity, written in the fourteenth century, not on parchment, but on cotton paper; and it was registered as a book 'On all Heresies,' without any indication of its author or age. The modern date of the manuscript, its anonymousness, and probably, above all, this awful title, deterred the scrutinizing eyes of the learned of all nations who glanced over it. It fell to the lot of a distinguished Greek scholar and writer on literature, a functionary of that great institution, M. Emmanuel Miller, to bring forward the hidden treasure. He was first struck by some precious fragments of Pindar, and of an unknown lyric poet, quoted by the anonymous writer: he transcribed and communicated them, in 1846, to his literary friends in Germany, who, highly appreciating their value, restored the text, and urged him to publish the whole work." Bunsen, *Hippolytus and his Age*, 2d ed., London 1854, p. 331. The brackets in the first sentence are of our own placing.

In § 23, p. 214, Hippolytus, speaking of Justin, says ἔπειτα τοὺς μύθους παρατίθησι ψυχαγωγίας χάριν, ὅπως οἱ ἐντυγχάνοντες κ.τ.λ., with ἀναγνωσμάτων in the same sentence, and with τοὺς ἀκρωμένους two lines above. Comp. with the parallel passages from the second *Prof. Sacr. Par.*, Clem. *Ep.* ii. 19, Phot. *Bibl.* 244, quoted on p. 147, and from pseudo-Basil on p. 161.

In the same sentence, Hippolytus has ὃν τρόπον εἴ τις ὁδὸν μακρὰν βαδίζων, παρατυχὼν καταλύματι ἀναπαύεσθαι δοκεῖ . . . πῇ δὲ παραπεποιημένοις βιβλίοις κατὰ τι παρεμφαίνουσι ταῖς προειρημέναις αἰρέσεσιν. οἱ πάντες γὰρ ἐν πνεύματι συνωθούμενοι εἰς ἐνὰ βυθὸν ἀμάρας συνάγονται, and after three lines 1 Cor. ii. 9 ἃ ὁφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδεν κ.τ.λ., followed by LXX. Ps. cix. 4.

First of all, compare Clem. *Ep.* i. 44 μακάριοι οἱ προοδοιπορήσαντες (obs.) πρεσβύτεροι, οἵτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν (here in Hippol.) ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν (obs.), followed after five lines by ἐνκύπτετε εἰς τὰς γραφάς, τὰς ἀληθεῖς, τὰς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου· ἐπίστασθε ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄδικον οὐδὲ παραπεποιημένον (obs.) γέγραπται ἐν αὐταῖς.

Next, comp. Clem. *Ep.* i. 33 ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες (obs.) τῇ συνειδήσει, ὡς ἐξ ἐνὸς στόματος κ.τ.λ., followed in the next sentence by 1 Cor. ii. 9. Clement immediately afterwards, speaking of the gifts of God, has the noteworthy expression λαμπρότης ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. In LXX. Ps. cix. (obs.) 3, we find μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς δυνάμεώς σου, ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησι τῶν ἁγίων σου.

In *Ep.* ii. 11, Clement quotes 1 Cor. ii. 9. As Lightfoot shows, the two epistles are closely connected at this point.

In *Ep.* ii. 14, a portion of 1 Cor. ii. 9 is quoted: οὐτε ἐξειπεῖν τις δύναται οὔτε καλῆσαι ἢ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ Κύριος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ. Hippolytus has ἄρρητα φυλάξαι τὰ τῆς διδασκαλίας σιγώμενα in the same sentence as 1 Cor. ii. 9, and μήτε ἐξειπεῖν a few lines above it.

It is to be observed that the connection between *Ep.* i. 34 and *Ep.* ii. 11, in connection with Clement's peculiar version of Isa. xl. 10, has been commented upon on p. 69 sq.

Clement's rendering is ἰδοὺ ὁ Κύριος, καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστω κατὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ. In *Ep.* ii. 11 we have ὑπομείνωμεν, ἵνα καὶ τὸν μισθὸν κομισώ-

μεθα, πιστὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπαγγελιάμενος τὰς ἀντιμισθίας ἀποδιδόναι ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. In *Ep.* ii. 15, immediately after the use of 1 Cor. ii. 9 (close of § 14), Clement has μισθὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν μικρὸς πλανωμένην ψυχὴν καὶ ἀπολλυμένην ἀποστρέψαι εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι, ταύτην γὰρ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἀποδοῦναι τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ. The idea of μισθός is thus everywhere in Clement connected with 1 Cor. ii. 9. The particular shape which the idea takes seems, however, to have been a matter of serious (?) consideration. 1 Cor. ii. 9 closes *Ep.* ii. 11. In § 12, the most curious part of *Ep.* ii. begins. The writer says (we use Lightfoot's translation), "For the Lord Himself, being asked by a certain person when His kingdom would come, said, *When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female* (καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας), *neither male nor female*. Now the two are one, when we speak truth among ourselves, and in two bodies (ἐν δυσὶ σώμασιν) there shall be one soul without dissimulation." In the next line but one Clement has ὃν τρόπον οὖν κ.τ.λ. Comp. with Hippolytus, quoted above.

If we turn to Hippolytus, we find that the fable of Hercules—the loss of his horses, the receiving them as a μισθόν from Echidna, who is called δίσωμος—follows almost immediately the citation of 1 Cor. ii. 9. Hippolytus says that the story is taken from Herodotus. If we turn to *lib.* iv. 8–10 we observe ἐπείρεσθαί μιν εἴ κου ἴδοι ἵππους πλανωμένας (obs.) τὴν δὲ φάναι, ἑωυτὴν ἔχειν, καὶ οὐκ ἀποδώσειν (obs.) ἐκείνῳ πρὶν ἢ οἱ μιχθῆναι· τὸν δὲ Ἡρακλέα μιχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ μισθῷ τούτῳ· κείνην τε δὴ ὑπερβαλέσθαι τὴν ἀπόδοσιν τῶν ἵππων . . . καὶ τὸν, κομισάμενον (obs.), ἐθέλειν ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι. τέλος δέ, ἀποδιδούσαν αὐτὴν εἰπεῖν. "Ἴππους μὲν δὴ ταύτας ἀπικομένας ἐνθάδε, ἕσωσά τοι ἐγώ· σῶστρα (reward for saving life, or thank-offering for deliverance, obs.) δὲ σὺ παρέσχες" κ.τ.λ. Comp. with Clem. *Ep.* ii. 15, quoted just above. It is impossible that the coincidences pointed out should have accidentally arisen. They do not seem, however, as a whole to be such as would have arisen simply from one or more persons having copied from Hippolytus. They point to one hand and one mind, or else, and more probably, to two or more persons following in one another's footsteps, understanding one another's jokes, and trying from time to time to turn those jokes in other directions.

We shall find directly a singular confirmation of this opinion.

3. We return now to the passage (p. 201) from Xenophon which some editors consider to be an interpolation. Kühner says : " Apposite *Bornemannus comparat Achill. Tat.* p. 8, 29 (*lib.* i. 4, p. 14, Mitscherlich 1792), *κάλλος γὰρ ὀξύτερον τιτρώσκει βέλους, καὶ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν τιτρώσκει.*" The passage is " apposite " enough, and at once connects the pages in which it is found with those of the other writings which we have been examining, and which have been shown to be so curiously mixed up one with another, and with the column of Cedrenus where Xenophon is quoted.

We have now in our hands the narrative of the adventures of Clitophon and the maiden Leucippe. Clitophon was the son of Hippias, whose brother Sostratus was the father of Leucippe.

If we open this love-story at the place indicated, we cannot fail to be struck by the number of reminiscences, as it were, which we meet with in the immediate neighbourhood, of matters which have been but just now under our special consideration.

We take up the story in § 3, only a few lines above the passage just quoted. Tatius writes . . . τοῦ πάθους¹ τὴν ἀκμήν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἶχον ἔννατον ἔτος ἐπὶ τοῖς δέκα, καὶ παρεσκευάζεν ὁ πατήρ εἰς νέωτα ποιῆσαι τοὺς γάμους, ἤρχετο τοῦ δράματος ἡ τύχη. Comp. ἐπενεγκεῖν τε διὰ τοῦτο δίκην τῷ πατρί περὶ τῆς ἰδίας γυναικός, τῆς τυχῆς ὥσπερ ἐν δράμασι κ.τ.λ., with τὴν ἀκμήν a few lines below, and τῆς ἀκμῆς a few lines above, in both cases in connection with a father's marriage of his daughter. Phot. *Bibl.* 244 (the excerpts on *hermaphrodites*).

The story proceeds : ὄναρ ἐδόκουν συμφύναι τῇ παρθένῳ τὰ κάτω μέρη μέχρις ὀμφαλοῦ, δύο δ' ἐντεῦθεν τὰ ἄνω σάματα· ἐφίσταται δέ μοι γυνὴ φοβερὰ καὶ μεγάλῃ, τὸ πρόσωπον ἀγρία . . . ὅφεις αἱ κόμαι· ἄρπην ἐκράτει τῇ δεξιᾷ, δᾶδα τῇ λαίᾳ· ἐπιπεσοῦσα οὖν μοι θυμῷ, καὶ ἀνατείνασα τὴν ἄρπην, καταφέρει τῆς ἰξύος, ἔνθα τῶν δύο σωμάτων ἦσαν αἱ συμβολαί, καὶ ἀποκόπτει μοῦ τὴν παρθένον.

Comp. with Eustathius. Hippolytus (p. 218) says that

¹ Comp. τοῦ πάθους εἰς ἀκμήν ἱλκομένου in the account of the death of the locust-eater. Phot. *Bibl.* 250, c. xxvii. (Agatharchides), *vid. sup.* p. 102.

Echidna was φρικτόν τι θέαμα, ὀργίλη, and δίσωμος. Comp. also the καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, and the ἐν δυσὶ σώμασιν of Clem. *Ep.* ii. 12 (*vid. sup.* p. 206). In the parallel passage in Herodotus we find τὸ τόξον ᾧδε διατεινόμενον (obs.) . . . τὸ τόξον τε καὶ τὸν ζωστῆρα ἔχοντα ἐπ' ἄκρης τῆς συμβολῆς (obs.) κ.τ.λ. Compare. Cedrenus, in the column now in hand, says of Anacharsis : εἰώθει γὰρ τῇ μὲν λαιᾷ χειρὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα κατέχειν, τῇ δὲ δεξιᾷ δὲ τὰ χεῖλη συνέχειν, ὑπεμφαίνειν. Compare.

At this juncture Hippias received a letter from Sostratus, informing him that Sostratus' wife Panthia, and daughter Leucippe, were on their way to him, having been driven from home by a war that was raging. Remember Pantheia and the wife and daughters of Darius, of whom Cedrenus speaks.

These ladies immediately appear upon the scene : ὥς δὲ ἐπέτεινα (Clitophon says) τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπ' αὐτήν, ἐν ἀριστερᾷ παρθένος ἐμφαίνεται (obs.) μοι, καὶ καταστράπτει μοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῷ προσώπῳ, τοιαύτην εἶδον ἐγὼ ποτε ἐπὶ ταύρῳ γεγραμμένην Εὐρώπην. Comp. with the description of Anacharsis just given out of Cedrenus. In *Theoph.* xviii., shortly after the passage quoted on p. 203, we observe ὁρᾷ τινὰς ἀστράπτοντας ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, and a little lower down on the same page, ὁρᾷ . . . καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ θρόνου, ὃν ποτε εἶδεν ἐν κ.τ.λ.

This lady was exceedingly beautiful : καὶ ἐμιμεῖτο πορφύραν, οἷαν εἰς τὸν ἐλέφαντα Λυδὴ βάπτει γυνή. τὸ στόμα ῥόδων ἄνθος ἦν, ὅταν ἄρχηται τὸ ῥόδον ἀνοίγειν τῶν φύλλων τὰ χεῖλη. Comp. again with the account of Anacharsis given by Cedrenus, who says in the same place that the Brahmins clothed themselves with φύλλοις. Remember also the Lydian lady (Omphale) of the *Oratio*.

The next words in Tatius are those quoted above, in illustration of the suspected passage of Xenophon. In the following sentence we observe οἱ δὲ (Clitophon's eyes) οὐκ ἤθελον, ἀλλ' ἀνθεῖλον ἐαυτοὺς ἐκτὶ τῷ τοῦ κάλλους ἐλκόμενοι πταίσματι, καὶ τέλος ἐνίκησαν. Comp. pseudo-Basil's description of the allurements of "Vice," in his account of the "choice of Hercules" (*vid. sup.* p. 160), and the parallel in the second *Pref. Sacr. Par.*

All the foregoing coincidences with Xenophon, Cedrenus, the *Oratio*, Clement, Herodotus, pseudo-Basil, *Theophilus*, have

been found in less than fifty lines of Greek. The coincidences, however, do not stop here. In § 5 is a description of a feast and a song: τὸ δὲ ᾄσμα ἦν, 'Απόλλων μεμφόμενος φεύγουσαν τὴν Δάφνην, καὶ διώκων ἄμα καὶ μέλλων καταλαμβάνειν' . . . τοῦτό μου μᾶλλον ἀσθενοῦσαν εἰς τέλος τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξέκαυσεν. Comp. Δάφνην ἐδίωξεν ἦν οὐ κατέλαβε, *Orat.* ii., referred to on p. 197, and a few lines above the passage quoted on p. 180. Comp. also εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀπονοίας ἐξέκαυσαν, *Clem. Ep.* i. 1. In *Appendix A*, the words εἰς τοσοῦτο (*τοσοῦτον*, v.l.) . . . πόλυ μᾶλλον ἐξέκαυσαν, *Diod.* xiv. 76, p. 701, are shown to be used by Clement. Compare now with Tatius.

In § 6, we find βιβλίον ἄμα κρατῶν καὶ ἐγκεκυφώς (*Clem. Ep.* i. §§ 40, 45, 53), ἀνεγίνωσκον.

In § 7, Clitophon says that a relative of his named Clinias loved a youth named Charicles, and bestowed on him a horse. Clitophon makes a confidant of this Clinias, who was an adept in love matters. As they are conversing, Charicles runs in to say that his father had determined to marry him to a rich but ill-favoured woman. Charicles and Clinias are filled with dismay, and Clinias inveighs against marriage: τὸ μὲν γὰρ Ἑλένης τῶν γάμων πῦρ ἀνῆψε κατὰ τῆς Τροίας ἄλλο πῦρ . . . ὃ πάντα τολμῶσαι γυναῖκες καὶ φιλοῦσι . . . καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῶν εὐμόρφων τίς ἂν εἴποι γυναικῶν, ἔνθα καὶ μέτριον τὸ ἀτύχημα. . . . εἰ δὲ μηδὲ εὐμορφος, ὥς φῆς, ἡ συμφορὰ διπλῇ· καὶ πῶς ἂν τις ἀνάσχοιτο, καὶ ταῦτα μειράκιον οὕτω καλόν; This takes us back at once to the column of Cedrenus: . . . τὰ φιλήματα τῶν εὐμόρφων . . . οὗτος ἂν καὶ εἰς μαχαίρας κυβιστήσῃ (we shall find this directly) καὶ εἰς πῦρ ἐμπέσῃ· ὁ τοσαύτην δηλονότι πυρὰν ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατατολμήσας ἀνάψαι. Διογένης δὲ θεασάμενος μειράκιον . . . κεκοσμημένην εἶπεν Εἰ μὲν πρὸς ἄνδρας, ἀτυχεῖς . . . Ἀγασίλαος εὐμόρφου ἦρα παιδός . . . ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος . . . ἠνέσχετο. It has been pointed out on p. 174, that in Cedrenus and *Peregrinus* there is a play upon the word "fire"—the literal fire into which Hercules and Proteus jumped, and the fire of lustful desire of which Xenophon speaks. Cedrenus' κατατολμήσας and the ἐτόλμησε of *Peregrinus* have been shown to be taken from Xenophon's ἐτόλμησε (*obs.*) τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδου υἱὸν φιλεῖν (*obs.*). Comp. now with Tatius.

To raise his depressed spirits, Charicles went for a ride upon the horse which had been given to him. Clitophon and

Clinias meanwhile continue their conversation. In § 12, a slave rushes in with the startling intelligence that Charicles was dead. His horse, it appears, turned restive, and finally bolted. The rider was tossed about (ταλαντευόμενος) as in some tempestuous sea, now upon the horse's tail, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τράχηλον κυβιστῶν (Xen. Cedren. *Peregrin.*). He was at length dashed against a tree, and hurled to the ground, every branch leaving its mark upon his unhappy countenance. In falling he became entangled with the reins, and was dragged, and at last trampled upon and kicked beyond recognition.

Bitter was the lamentation of the father over the battered remains of his son: . . . οὐδὲ κοινῷ μοι θανάτῳ τέθνηκας—death usually removes the soul but leaves the form of the man, σοῦ δὲ ὁμοῦ καὶ ταῦτα διέφθειρεν ἢ τύχῃ, καὶ μοι τέθνηκας θάνατον διπλοῦν, ψυχῇ καὶ σάρματι· οὕτως σου τέθνηκεν καὶ σῆς εἰκόνης ἢ σκιά. Comp. τί οὖν Λέων . . . αὐτὸς παραχρῶν καὶ σκανδαλῶν τὴν εὐδαίμονα πόλιν ἐμπέπλησιν, οἰμωγαί τε καὶ θρῆνοι καὶ δάκρυα καὶ στεναγμοὶ πανταχόθεν διέτρεχον. διπλοῦς γὰρ ἦν ὁ θάνατος (obs. all these words) ψυχῶν τε καὶ σαρκῶν . . . εἰπών· Ἀπόστα ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, Ἰησοῦ βασιλεῦ· ὁδοῦς (obs.) σου οὐ βουλόμεθα εἰδέναι (obs.). καὶ τούτου τὸν σεβασμιον χαρακτῆρα τὸν ὄντα ἐν τῇ Χαλκῇ, λίθοις καὶ κόπροις καὶ πηλώδεσι μάζαις, ἐμπύοντες εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον (obs.) αὐτοῦ, προσέριπτον, διαρρήξαντες αὐτὸν εἰς τοῦδαφος, and after five lines ὁ Κύριος . . . εἰκόνα ἐν χερσὶ κρατήσας, καὶ εἰρηκώς, Τίνος ἢ εἰκῶν κ.τ.λ., *Theoph.* 24. A few lines above the writer has μύστης. Tatius shortly before (in § 9) has μύστης, and in the next line οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ ἐγὼ τὰς ὁδοῦς.

The coincidences here cannot be accidental, for we must observe not only the verbal resemblances, but also the general parallel—the weeping and wailing in both Tatius and *Theophilus*, the disfigured face and body, dashed violently to the earth, of Charicles in Tatius, and the sacred image, spat upon (in the face), hurled to the ground and crushed in *Theophilus*. These coincidences, moreover, do not stand alone. Others have been produced which seem to indicate some close connection between Tatius' tale and *Theophilus*. Even as the case at present stands, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that this love story is not a writing of the sixth century (or earlier), as it has been supposed to be, but a member of

the group of writings which we have been examining, and concerning which we know at least this much, that their authors strove to shelter themselves under the authority of Photius, by interpolating his *Bibliotheca*.

We shall now show that this conclusion at which we have just arrived is a necessary one, by producing from the pages of Tattius' tale illustrations of a great number of matters in connection with the *Evang. Thom.*, *Peregrinus*, Clement's *Epistles*, etc., to which attention has been already specially directed, and by proving that the writing is indebted to Photius' *Bibliotheca*, and therefore cannot be the writing which is described in it, unless, indeed, that description is itself an interpolation.

1. The lamentation of Charicles' father, from which we were just now quoting, together with that of Clinias which follows, supplies a number of coincidences with the close of *Peregrinus*, at the very point where, as has been shown on p. 170, the pages of Xenophon, which led us to Achilles Tattius, are made use of. We shall take one only. Clinias addresses the horse: . . . ἀναίσθητε κάλλους . . . ἐπῆναι τὸν δρόμον, σὺ δὲ ἀπέκτεινας ἐπαινούμενος κ.τ.λ. Comp. ὥς καὶ εἰς πῦρ ἀλέσθαι (Xenophon) ὅτε μὴδ' ἀπολαύειν τῶν ἐπαίνων (obs.) ἔμελλε, ἀναίσθητος (obs.) αὐτῶν γενόμενος, *Peregrin.* 42. Tattius in § 12 has ὁ δὲ ἵππος . . . ἐμποδιζόμενος εἰς τὸν δρόμον. Comp. δρόμον διανύουσιν, μὴδὲν ἀλλήλοις ἐμποδιζόντα, *Clem. Ep.* i. 20.

2. In the same place Tattius uses the word *νυμφική*. This recalls the *νυμφικὴν στολὴν* of the *Oratio* and the discussion thereon. In *lib.* iii. 7, Tattius has *νυμφικῶς ἐστολισμένη* of Andromeda chained to the rock and awaiting death. In *lib.* vi. 1, Clitophon puts on female attire, and the lady remarks σὺ δὲ ἐνδύθι τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν ἐμὴν . . . ὥς εὐμορφότερος παρὰ πολὺ γέγονας τῇ στολῇ (obs.); τοιοῦτον Ἀχιλλέα ποτὲ ἐθεασάμην ἐν γραφῇ (*vid. sup.* p. 176).

There are a few coincidences of small moment in themselves, but which have a certain cumulative force which we may here notice,—in *lib.* iv. 12 ἐν ταύταις δὴ ταῖς λίμναις μέσαι νῆσοί τινες εἰσιν σποράδην κ.τ.λ., *vid. sup.* p. 158; in the same section τῇδε κἀκεῖσε, *vid. sup.* p. 165, pseudo-Basil; in *lib.* ii. 18 ἐπεὶ δὲ συνετίθειμεν τὴν πυράν, *vid. sup.* p. 173, *Peregrinus*; in the same section τούτων δὲ τὴν Ζήνωνα ἐλάνθανεν οὐδὲν, *vid. sup.* pp.

111, 121, Clement and *Theophilus*; in *lib.* ii. 8 ἐγὼ . . . λυπούμενος, ἢ δ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως, and in vii. 9 οὐκ οἶδα πῶς, οὐτ' εἰ κ.τ.λ., *vid. sup.* p. 203, *Theophilus*; in *lib.* iv. 7 στρατιώτης δὲ ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων μάχην. Comp. Clem. *Ep.* ii. 7 ὅτι ἐν χερσὶν ὁ ἀγών among the words to which reference is made on p. 186.

3. We return now to § 7, and the gift of the horse to Charicles. Clinias is described as being an adept in love matters, μειρακίου δὲ ὁ ἔρως ἦν· οὕτω δὲ εἶχε φιλοτιμίας πρὸς αὐτόν, ὥστε καὶ ἵππον πριάμενος, ἐπεὶ θεασάμενον τὸ μειράκιον (Cedrenus has these words) ἐπήνεσεν, εὐθὺς ἐχαρίσατο, φέρων (obs.) αὐτῷ τὸν ἵππον (obs.). Comp. here with Hippol. *Refutatio* (*vid. sup.* p. 204). Clitophon, it seems, used to take Clinias to task for being the δοῦλον of this passion. When Clitophon himself fell in love, he felt that the tables were turned . . . δοῦλος γέγονα καὶ γὰρ. It has been pointed out on p. 61 that Arist. *Plut.* 147 ἐγωγέ τοι . . . δοῦλος γεγένημαι, appears to be used in the *Evang. Thom.*; and on p. 54 that *Plut.* 157 ὁ μὲν ἵππον ἀγαθόν, ὁ δὲ κύνας θηρευτικάς, probably suggested the joke about the horse in the pseudo-Helladian excerpt. Comp. the first of these lines with Tatius. Aristophanes is saying that the boys veiled their demand for money under requests for horses or dogs. Comp. with Tatius. Nor does the use of Aristophanes appear doubtful, for the latter half of the line seems plainly to be alluded to in *lib.* ii. 34, where a certain Menelaus is telling Clinias what was the πρόφασις of his own sojourn in foreign lands. He says that it was ἔρως βάσκανος, καὶ θήρα δυστυχής· ἦραν δὲ μειρακίου καλοῦ. τὸ δὲ μειράκιον, φιλόθηρον ἦν. In *lib.* v. 25, Tatius has καλλους καλοῦ βάσκανε (*vid. sup.* pp. 145, 150, and comp. Eusebius, *Theophilus*, Diodorus). Menelaus could not prevent the youth from hunting, so he went with him to the field, and there accidentally killed him. Comp. the story of Apollo and Hyacinth, referred to in the *Oratio* (*vid. sup.* p. 197). When Clinias heard the lamentable story he was much overcome: Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν ἀναμνησθεῖς Χαρικλέους. καὶ ὁ Μενέλαος. Τὰ μὲν δακρύεις; ἔφη. In reply, Clinias καταλέγει τὸν Χαρικλέα καὶ τὸν ἵππον. Comp. with Aristophanes.

4. We observe here the word πρόφασις. It may be remembered (*vid. sup.* p. 192) that this word formed part of the connecting link between *Clem. Hom.* vi. and Eurip. *Iph. Aul.*

It is proper to inquire whether the story of Iphigenia is taken up by Tatius, as we have already seen it to be taken up by Clement and the writer of the *Oratio*. It has been shown that the *Homily* took the word from *Iph. Aul.* 884. The word is found again in that portion of the play which came more especially under our notice: 'ΙΦ. μήτερ, τί σιγῇ δακρύοις τέγγεις κόρας; ΚΛ. ἔχω τάλαινα πρόφασιν ὥστ' ἄλγῃν φρένα. These words might well have suggested the Homeric proverb. In line 1373, Euripides has καὶ πλέον πράττωμεν οὐδέν, ὅδε δὲ συμφορᾷς τύχη. In *lib.* ii. 24, Tatius has οὐδὲ οἰδᾷ μου τῆς συμφορᾷς τὴν τύχην. This is very amusing. In *lib.* vii. 6, Tatius has ὅτι μοι δέδοκται πάντως ἀποθανεῖν, and in iii. 22 εἰ δέ τις ἡμῶν ἐκποδὼν γένηται, σῶζε σεαυτὴν ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἐξαγομεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν. On p. 193 special attention is directed to *Peregrin.* 33 σῶζου τοῖς Ἕλλησιν . . . τέλει τὰ δεδογμένα, and the lines of Euripides on which the language is founded. Add, from *Iph. Aul.* 1376, παρῆσά γ' ἐκποδὼν τὸ δυσγενές (obs.), and comp. all with Tatius.

In *lib.* iii. 22, from which we have just quoted, Leucippe is indeed about to be sacrificed evidently in parody of Iphigenia. In this book Clitophon, Leucippe, and their party are taken prisoners by a band of robbers. The leader of the band gives directions that εἰ τις παρθένος ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς εἰλημμένοις, ταύτην ἀπάγειν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἱερεῖον ἐσομένην καὶ καθάρσιον τοῦ στρατοῦ, § 12. In *lib.* vi. 2, Tatius has the proverb κατὰ τὴν ἑλαφον ἀντὶ παρθένου, and so here he works out a deliverance for Leucippe, though it does not quite resemble that whereby Euripides saved Iphigenia. Tatius says that Leucippe's friends fitted to her a false stomach made out of sheepskin, and filled with entrails and blood. The friendly sacrificer had a knife the blade of which retreated into the handle, save only the point, which projected far enough to enable him to rip open the false stomach. When the appointed day came (§ 15), Leucippe was laid upon the altar, and διεκλύσας τὸ ξίφος εἰς τὴν κάτω γαστέρα, ῥήγνυσιν τὰ σπλάγχνα δὲ εὐθὺς ἐξεπῆδησεν. These they dragged out and κατατεμόντες ἅπαντες εἰς μοίρας ἔφαγον.

There is no ring of antiquity about these jokes; they are, however, exceedingly like those which we find in Phot. *Bibl.* 244, in the description of the conversion of the *hermaphrodites*

into men, to which attention has been called on p. 190. We find there, in the one case, a ῥήξις (comp.), and in the other a τομή (comp.): ἔτεμε τὸν ἐπηρμένον τόπον (an expression eminently applicable to Leucippe's false stomach), ἐξ οὗπερ ἐξέπεσεν ἀνδρὸς αἰδοῖα κ.τ.λ. Here, in § 16, Clitophon, who was deceived by what he saw, says καὶ σε ζῶσαν ἀνέτεμον, οἶμοι, καὶ βλέπουσαν ὅλην τὴν ἀνατομὴν κ.τ.λ. The word τομή is used several times by Tatius elsewhere.

We now come, in connection with this parody of the sacrifice of Iphigenia, to one of the most painful jokes to be found in any of our writings, which we should not venture to point out if we did not believe it to be perfectly undeniable, and if the character of the joke did not seem to have something to say as to the date when this love story under the name of Achilles Tatius was written.

In the beginning of *lib.* iv. Clitophon pleads with Leucippe for the fulfilment of his hopes. She replied that it was not lawful, ἡ γάρ μοι θεὸς Ἄρτεμις ἐπιστάσα πρῶην κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους, ὅτε ἔκλαιον μέλλουσα σφαγήσεσθαι. Μὴ νῦν, ἔφη, κλαῖε· οὐ γάρ τε θνήξῃ. βοηθὸς γὰρ ἐγὼ σοι παρέσομαι· μενεῖς δὲ παρθένος, ἐστ' ἂν σε νυμφοστολήσω· ἄξιται δὲ σε ἄλλος οὐδεὶς ἢ Κλειτοφών. While Clitophon was trying to comfort himself with ταῖς τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐλπίσιν, he recollected a very similar dream which he himself had had. He thought he saw the temple of Venus and a statue of the goddess within: ὥς δὲ πλησίον ἐγενόμην προσευζόμενος, κλεισθῆναι τὰς θύρας. ἀθυμοῦντι δέ μοι γυναῖκα ἐκφανῆναι κατὰ τὸ ἀγαλμα τὴν μορφὴν ἔχουσαν. καὶ· Νῦν, εἶπεν, οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι παρελθεῖν εἶσω τοῦ νεῶ. ἦν δὲ ὀλίγον ἀναμείνης χρόνον, οὐκ ἀνοίξω σοι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἱερέα σὲ ποιήσω τῆς θεοῦ.

We may think of various scriptural parallels, which might possibly have been in the writer's mind, all more or less doubtful. There is one, however, as to which no reasonable doubt can be entertained. Comp. Rev. v. 4 καὶ ἐγὼ ἔκλαιον (obs.) πολλά, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἄξιος εὐρέθῃ ἀνοῖξαι (obs.) κ.τ.λ., ver. 5 καὶ εἰς ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λέγει μοι, Μὴ κλαῖε (obs.) κ.τ.λ., ver. 6 καὶ εἶδον . . . ἄρνιον ἐστηκὸς ὥς ἐσφαγμένον (obs.) κ.τ.λ., ver. 8 αἶ εἰσιν αἱ προσευχαὶ (obs.) τῶν ἁγίων, ver. 9 ἄξιος εἶ (obs.) . . . ἀνοῖξαι (obs.) κ.τ.λ., ver. 10 καὶ ἐποίησας (obs.) ἡμῶς τῷ Θεῷ (obs.) ἡμῶν βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς (obs.) κ.τ.λ. The verses of the

Book of Revelation are taken up in order, and the parody cannot be denied. The alteration of ἐσφαγμένον into μέλλουσα σφαγήσεται gives great point to it. We can hardly suppose this to be the work of an early writer.

Comp. further with Tatius καὶ ὀλίγον χρόνον (obs.) πακοπαθήσωσιν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, τὸν ἀθάνατον τῆς ἀναστάσεως καρπὸν τρυγήσουσιν· μὴ οὖν λυπεῖσθω ὁ εὐσεβής, ἐὰν ἐπὶ τοῖς νῦν (obs.) χρόνοις ταλαιπωρῇ· μακάριος αὐτὸν ἀναμένει (obs.) χρόνος κ.τ.λ. Clem. *Ep.* ii. 19. The remainder of the sentence is given in a note on p. 68, where a coincidence is pointed out between it and one of the forged excerpts from Agatharchides, an excerpt to which we shall have occasion to refer presently. It may also be noticed that in *Peregrin.* 26 the writer has εἰσὶ δ' οἱ καὶ μεταβάλλεσθαι φασιν αὐτόν, καὶ τινα ὀνείρατα (obs.) διηγέσθαι, ὥς τοῦ Διὸς οὐκ ἔωντος μιαίνειν ἱερὸν χωρίον. Comp. with Tatius. In *Peregrinus*, the writer goes on immediately to speak of the phoenix. In Tatius, a description of this bird immediately precedes the dreams recorded above. In *Peregrin.* 33 (just referred to), the writer has οὐ μετρίως ἐθορυβήθη, and Tatius here in iv. 1 οὐ μετρίως ἐτάραττόμην.

5. We have said that Tatius uses the word τομή. It is found in *lib.* iii. 13, in the description of a fight between the robbers who were about to sacrifice Leucippe and some regular troops. Tatius speaks of the "clean cut" (τομή) of the βέλως as compared with the τὸ τραῦμα καὶ οἰδημα ὥς ἀπὸ λίθου of the βῶλος with which the robbers had armed themselves. There is the same contrast here lying behind which we have already seen between ῥῆξις and τομή; and so in Phot. *Bibl.* 244, in the case which led to the ῥῆξις, mention is also made of οἰδήσαντος τοῦ τόπου. Compare.

The description of the fight is compiled in great measure out of Diod. xvii. 33 sq. (p. 184). The way in which the various points of Diodorus' narrative of a battle in which fifty myriads of men were engaged are taken up in Tatius' account of a fight in which fifty ὀπλῖται are concerned, is very amusing. We must confine our attention, however, to one point only. When the robbers had wearied themselves out through the multitude of βῶλων which they hurled, the fifty men composing the "phalanx" opened out and allowed the more lightly armed men to make their attack, καὶ ἀκοντίζουσιν ἅμα, καὶ ἦν

οὐδείς ὃς οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν, εἴτα οἱ ὀπλῖται προσέρρουν· καὶ ἦν ἡ μάχη στέρρά, πληγαὶ δὲ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων, καὶ τραύματα καὶ σφαγαί. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἔμπειρον παρὰ τοῖς στρατιώταις ἀνεπλήρου τοῦ πλήθους τὸ ἐνδées, with ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους after two lines. Diodorus has οἱ ἱππεῖς . . . διαφέροντες . . . ταῖς ἐμπειρίαις . . . παρ' ἀμφοτέροις . . . ἡ μὲν μάχη . . . ἐταλαντεύετο (*vid. sup. p. 210*, Charicles on horseback) γὰρ δεῦρο κἀκείσε, τῆς τροπῆς ἐναλλάξ γινομένης· οὔτε γὰρ ἀκοντίσας, οὔτε πατάξας οὐδείς ἀπρακτον ἔσχε τὴν πληγὴν, ὡς ἂν διὰ τὸ πλήθος ἐτοίμου τοῦ σκοποῦ κειμένου. διὸ καὶ πολλοῖς τραύμασιν ἐναντίοις περιτυγχάνοντες ἐπιπτον. οἱ δὲ . . . θυμαχοῦντες κ.τ.λ. We have thus an excellent parallel with Tatius, and we have it in the very pages, even in the very sentence (containing ἐναλλάξ), on which so much has been said on pp. 23, 74, 88 sq. (*vid. Appendix A*) in connection with Clement, the *Evang. Thom.*, pseudo-Galen, *Peregrinus*, and Phot. *Bibl.* 244. We have thus a confirmation of our opinion of the use made of those particular pages of Diodorus by our writers. In *lib. vi. 19*, Tatius is speaking of persons in whom both θυμός (*obs.*) and ἔρως are raging, and he says ὅταν οὖν ἄμφω τὸν ἄνθρωπον καταλάβῃ, γίνεται μὲν αὐτοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ τρυτάνη, τὸ δὲ πῦρ ἐκατέρου ταλαντεύεται, μαχέται δὲ ἄμφω κ.τ.λ. Comp. with Diodorus.

6. We find another use of *τομή* in *lib. ii. 24*. In § 19, we are told that Leucippe agreed to receive Clitophon into her chamber. There were difficulties in the way, however, because Panthia was no less careful of her daughter than pseudo-Galen's mother of her son Cyril. A description is given of the rooms occupied by the women, and of the precautions taken for safety: κατακομίζουσα δὲ αἰετὴν Λευκίππην ἡ μήτηρ, ἔκλειε ἐνδοθεν τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ στενωποῦ θύραν· ἔξωθε δὲ τις ἕτερος ἀπέκλειε, καὶ τὰς κλειῖς ἔβαλλε διὰ τῆς ὀπῆς· ἡ δὲ λαβοῦσα ἐφύλαττεν, καὶ περὶ τὴν ἑὴ καλέσασα τὸν εἰς τοῦτο ἐπιτεταγμένον, διέβαλλε πάλιν τὰς κλειῖς, ὅπως ἀνοίξειεν. Comp. pseudo-Galen's story of "the keys," and the words given on pp. 84, 85. Clitophon triumphed over all difficulties, and obtained admittance to his lady's bed-chamber. Panthia, however, dreaming that a robber was attacking her daughter with a sword, and waking up in alarm, hurried into the room and Clitophon had to make his escape as best he could. In § 24,

Panthia, who supposed the worst, utters a lamentation over her daughter: . . . Σώστρατε (the father). σὺ μὲν ἐν Βυζαντίῳ πολεμεῖς ὑπὲρ ἁλλοτρίων γάμων· ἐν Τύρῳ δὲ καταπεπολέμησαι, καὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου τίς τοὺς γάμους ἐσύλησεν. Comp. with the *Oratio*, pseudo-Basil, and Plutarch, quoted on p. 174. Panthia proceeds νῦν ἀθλιώτερον ἀνετμήθης τὴν γαστέρα. αὕτη δυστυχεστέρα τῆς μαχαίρας τομῇ (obs.), οὐδὲ ἴδον τὸν ὑβρίσαντά σε, οὐδὲ οἶδά μου τῆς συμφοράς τὴν τύχην (*vid. sup.* p. 213, where these words are shown to be taken from Eurip. *Iph. Aul.*). Here, then, it is plain that the writer had the same thoughts in his mind in connection with *τομή* as before, and as the writer of the account of the *hermaphrodites* in Phot. *Bibl.* 244.

The way in which point after point, to which special attention has been directed in earlier pages, are now being taken up and confirmed, is surely most remarkable.

7. In *lib.* iv. 4, Tatius gives a description of the elephant. The elephant-hunters, and the methods of capturing their prey, were subjects, as we have seen (*vid. sup.* p. 67), of merriment with the writers of the *Evang. Thom.* and the excerpts from Agatharchides. We turn, therefore, with some interest to see what Tatius has to say.

(1.) . . . μαστίζοντος ἀνέχεται· ἡ δὲ μάστιξ αὐτῷ πέλεκυς σιδηροῦς. This seems a severe riding whip even for an elephant. We do not forget, however, that the *πέλεκυς* plays a very important part in the slaughter of the elephant, as it is described in the so-called excerpts from Agatharchides, nor that it belongs to one of the jokes of the *Evang. Thom.* (*vid. sup.* p. 62).

(2.) The narrator says that he had seen a man place his head upon the middle of the elephant's head, and that the elephant then breathed hard upon the man's head. The meaning of this was, that the man had a headache, and that the breath of the elephant, being charged with aromatics, acted as a cure. The object of this story is simply to introduce a joke, with which we have already become familiar: οἶδεν οὖν τὴν θεραπείαν ὁ ἐλέφας, καὶ προῖκα οὐκ ἀνοίγει στόμα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἰατρὸς (obs.) ἀλαζάν, καὶ τὸν μισθὸν (obs.) πρῶτος αἰτεῖ (obs.). καὶν δῶς, πείθεται, καὶ παρέχει τὴν χάριν, καὶ ἀπλοῦ τὴν γένυν, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐκδέχεται κεχηνώς, ὅσον ὁ ἄνθρωπος βούλεται.

οἶδε γὰρ ὅτι πέπρακε τὴν ὁσμὴν. Comp. the τὴν χάριν παρέχειν of *Theophilus* and Basil, *vid. sup.* pp. 122, 124. Χάρις (*vid. sup.* p. 115) is taken up by Tatius in the way that we should expect: καὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτης χάριν αὐτῇ παρέσχον πρὸ σοῦ. *lib.* vii. 5.

Here, then, we have the physician of Phot. *Bibl.* 244 asking for his reward. Comp. Clem. *Ep.* ii. 19, quoted along with Cod. 244, on p. 148. We must not suppose that Clement has no reference to the ἰατρός, as well as to the μισθόν, for in *Ep.* ii. 9 he says, ὡς ἔχομεν καιρὸν τοῦ ἰαθῆναι, ἐπιδῶμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεραπεύοντι Θεῷ, ἀντιμισθίαν αὐτῷ διδόντες.

Clement, however, and the writer of Cod. 244, speak of a "double reward." We must consider whether Tatius follows them in this also. Further on in this book, Leucippe is said to have taken an overdose of a love potion, and to have gone mad in consequence. The physicians were sent for, but could do no good (comp. Cod. 244). At length a person is found, who informed Clitophon of the cause of the madness, and of the name of the slave who had administered the noxious draught: τὸν μὲν (the slave) οὖν εἶχομεν ἐν φυλακῇ καθεύζαντες. This new doctor promised to cure αἰτεῖ δὲ χρυσοῦς τέτταρας ὑπὲρ τῆς ἰάσεως. Clitophon assented to this, and promised to double the reward if a cure was effected. The idea of this double reward, both here and in Cod. 244, is taken from Apollodorus, *lib.* ii. Apollodorus there speaks of the Danaids, and says that Hypermnestra saved Lynceus, παρθένον αὐτὴν φυλάζαντα (obs.) διὸ καθεύξας (obs.) αὐτὴν Δαναὸς ἐφρούρει. Comp. with Tatius. Lynceus had a son named Abas, and Abas a son named Proetus, whose daughters went mad (obs.), and behaved μετὰ ἀκοσμίας ἀπάσης. Tatius in § 9 makes this a special feature in Leucippe's madness. Melampus, the son of Amythaon and Idomene, τῆς Ἀβαντος, ὑπισχνεῖται (obs.) θεραπεύειν (obs.) τὰς παρθένας, εἰ λάβοιτο τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῆς δυναστείας. Proetus at first refused to give this great reward, but finding that his daughters grew worse, he yielded, τοὺς αἰτηθέντας (obs.) μισθοὺς (obs.) ὁ Προῖτος ἐδίδου. Melampus, however, ὑπέσχετο θεραπεύειν only on receiving (a double reward) another share of the kingdom for his brother Bias. Comp. with Tatius, also with Clement (*vid. sup.* p. 148), also with Cod. 244, and pseudo-Galen, *vid. sup.*

pp. 89, 90. There can be no doubt that the writer of Cod. 244 took the idea of the double reward from Apollodorus, for he has τῆς Ἀραβίας ἐν ταῖς καλουμέναις Ἀβαις (three times, and presently Ἀβας) ὅκει κ.τ.λ. As Wesseling says: "*Quærendæ sunt Abæ istæ Arabicae*," which, of course, gives great force to the coincidence. Twice Diodorus (*lib.* xiv. cc. 38, 58) speaks of a Locrian town τὰς ὀνομαζομένας Ἀβας. It would seem plain that the Ἀβας of Apollodorus recalled to the mind of the writer of the excerpt the Ἀβας of Diodorus.

(3.) In Tatius' account of the elephant, we observe the words βίον γὰρ αὐτῷ λέγουσιν ὑπὲρ τὴν Ἡσιόδου κορώνην. τοιαύτη ἐστὶν ἐλεφάντων ἡ γένυς, οἷα τῶν βοῶν ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ. σὺ μὲν γὰρ ἂν ἰδῶν, εἴποις κέρας ἔχειν αὐτῷ διπλοῦν τὸ στόμα. He uses apparently Plut. ii. p. 415. Just above the words quoted from *Peregrin.* 33, on p. 193, we find μακρὰ χαίρειν φράσας (*Ælian* applies these words to Calanus, and they are therefore here applied to Proteus, *vid. sup.* p. 172), θανατιῶντι σοφιστῇ (Proteus), τὸν ἐπιτάφιον ἑαυτοῦ πρὸ τελευτῆς διεξιόντι, πλὴν τόγχε τοσοῦτον ἐπήκουσα· ἔφη γὰρ βούλεσθαι χρυσῷ βίῳ χρυσὴν κορώνην ἐπιθεῖναι. Comp., both with Tatius and *Peregrinus*, Hom. *Il.* iv. 109 sq. τοῦ κέρα ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἐκκαιδεκάδωρα πεφύκει, | καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀσκήσας κεραοξόος ἤραρε τέκτων, | πᾶν δ' εὖ λειήνας, χρυσὴν ἐπέθηκε κορώνην, with διπλός in line 133. It would seem that Tatius, though taking his meaning of κορώνην from Plutarch, still "looked at" Homer as the writer of *Peregrinus* evidently did. This is confirmed by line 141, ὥς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μιῇν Μηονίς (Lydian). Comp. Tatius' οἷαν εἰς τὸν ἐλέφαντα Λυδίῃ βάπτει γυνή, quoted on p. 208. Homer is describing a bow, and thus it would seem that the joke of the bow, in the account of the capture of the elephant given in the excerpt from Agatharchides, appears in Tatius' description of the elephant in another form, and in *Peregrinus* in yet another. The writer of *Peregrinus*, it must be observed, equally with Tatius made use of Plutarch, for in § 41, speaking of the tomb of Proteus, he says τίνας δὲ κορώνας οὐκ ἐπιπτήσεσθαι, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἡσιόδου τάφον. Editors have perplexed themselves over these κορώνας, and their connection with the tomb of Hesiod. The connection of ideas in the mind of the writer of *Peregrinus* is, however,

very simply explained. Ælian (*N. H.* vi. 7) says that in Egypt κορώνης τάφος (obs.) δείκνυται, and he goes on to give the reason. There was, he says, a certain king named Marres, who had κορώνης θρέμμα πάνυ ἡμερον· καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ὅς ἐβούλετό οἱ κομισθῆναί ποι, θᾶπτον ἐκόμισεν αὐτῇ, καὶ ἦν ἀγγέλων ὠκίστη, καὶ ἀκούσασα, ἤδει ἔνθα ἰθύναι δεῖ τὸ πτερόν,—wherefore when it died Marres honoured it, καὶ στήλη καὶ τάφος. Accordingly, the writer of *Peregrinus* goes on at once to speak of Proteus' ἐπιστολάς, and the νεκραγγέλους by whom they were to be conveyed (*vid. sup.* p. 34 sq.). The tomb of Hesiod is brought in for the sake of the joke, and of a glance at Plutarch. We shall probably conclude that Tatius and the author of *Peregrinus*, if they were different persons, were pretty intimately acquainted with one another's secrets. This is to some small extent confirmed by the circumstance, that in *lib.* i. 3, Tatius has the expression ἔρχεται κομίζων ἐπιστολήν. Comp. with Ælian.

(4.) While describing the elephant's proboscis, Tatius says, ἂν δέ τι τῶν ἀδροτέρων ἴδῃ, τούτῳ περιβάλλει κύκλῳ τὴν ἄγρην περισφίγγας, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀνεκούφισε, and after four lines εἶδον δέ ποτε καὶ θέαμα καινόν. The description of the phoenix is close by, as we have said, and we have just referred to it. It is there said, ἔπεται δὲ αὐτῷ χορὸς ἄλλων ὀρνίθων ὥσπερ δορυφόρων, καὶ ἔοικεν ὁ ὄρνις ἀποδημοῦντι βασιλεῖ. Comp. καὶ δὴ περιβαλὼν ἑαυτῷ ὁ Σαββάτιος ἄλυσιν μεγίστην τῷ τραχήλῳ, καὶ σιδηροπέδαις ἑαυτὸν περισφίγγας, περικλείει ἑαυτὸν ἐν τοῖς . . . κούφοις, and after two lines καὶ ἰδοὺ καὶ ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων δορυφόρων φρουρούμενος βασιλεύς, and presently ὃν ποτε εἶδον. *Theoph.* xviii. *Vid. sup.* p. 208.

In a note on p. 68, a coincidence is pointed out between Clem. *Ep.* ii. 19 (to which many references have been made of late) and c. xxx. p. 454 of the so-called excerpts from Agatharchides. If we turn to the same excerpt, we find it to be said of the Troglodytes that, when they are old and unable to follow their flocks, some of them περιθέντες βοὸς οὐρανὸν περὶ τὸν αὐχένα τὸν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸν ὀπίσω τοῦ τραχήλου δεσμὸν εὖ μάλα περισφίγγαντες, ἀπολύουσι τοῦ βίου. This is so, the writer says, not only of the aged ἀλλὰ καὶ οὖς ἡ νόσος ἐπίμονος ἢ μελῶν τινος πῆρωσις ἀχρήστους εἰς τὸ ταῖς ἀγέλαις παρασκευάσει συνέπεσθαι, with κύκλῳ a few lines above. Comp.

with Tatius and *Theophilus*. The passage is founded on Diod. iii. 33, but the words ἐπίμονος ἢ μελῶν . . . ἀχρήστους . . . παρσκευάσει are not there. These last three words may be thought to have become connected together through the σκευὸς εὐχρηστον of 2 Tim. ii. 21, which is one of the μελῶν of the whole body. So Clement has τὰ δὲ ἐλάχιστα μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν ἀναγκαῖα καὶ εὐχρηστα ὄλα τῷ σώματι· ἀλλὰ πάντα συνπνεῖ κ.τ.λ., *Ep.* i. 37. So in *lib.* viii. 6, Tatius, who is expanding Ovid's (*Met.* i. 691 sq.) story of the metamorphosis of Syrinx into reeds, and Pan's discovery of the σύριγξ, says that the god συμφορήσας οὖν τὰ τετμημένα τῶν καλάρμων ὡς μέλη τοῦ σώματος, καὶ συνθεῖς εἰς ἓν σῶμα, εἶχε διὰ χειρῶν τὰς τομαῖς τῶν καλάρμων καταφιλῶν, ὡς τῆς κόρης τραύματα. ἔστνε δ' ἑρωτικὸν ἐπιθεῖς τὸ στόμα, καὶ ἐνέπνει . . . καὶ ἡ σύριγξ εἶχε φωνήν. Clement's συνπνεῖ seems thus to be explained.

In *Ep.* i. 46, 47, Clement writes:—

ἴνα τί . . . σχίσματα πόλεμός τε ἐν ὑμῖν ; . . . ἴνα τί . . . διασπῶμεν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ στασιάζομεν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἴδιον . . . ὥστε ἐπιλαθεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς ὅτι μέλη (obs.) ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων ; μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν (Clement borrows everything he writes, and here from Acts xx. 35)· εἶπε γάρ, Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, ἢ ἓνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι κρείττων ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι (obs.) μύλον καὶ καταποντισθῆναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι. τὸ σχίσμα ὑμῶν πολλοὺς διέστρεψεν, πολλοὺς εἰς ἀθυμίαν ἔβαλεν, πολλοὺς εἰς δισταγμόν, τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς εἰς λύπην· καὶ ἐπίμονος (obs.) ὑμῶν ἐστιν ἡ στάσις. § 47. ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν (1 Cor. obs.) τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου· τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν (obs.) ; using 1 Cor. i. 10 sq. . . νυνὶ δὲ κατανοήσατε τίνες ὑμᾶς διέστρεψαν (obs.) καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς περιβοήτου φιλαδελφίας ὑμῶν ἐμείωσαν (“comp. § 1, ὥστε τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ περιβόητον . . . ὄνομα . . . βλασφημηθῆναι,” Light.) . . . ὥστε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεισθαι τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου (“comp. Rom. ii. 24,” Light.).

Insert here after μύλον the words περὶ τὸν τράχηλον out of one of the gospels used in the above passage, and which properly belong to it, and then compare with the excerpt. It is impossible that the coincidences can have accidentally arisen.

The word διέστρεψεν has an interest of its own. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* iii. 18, p. 561, gives the above citation from the gospels, with small variation. He adds, however, after θάλασσαν, the clause ἢ ἓνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι, and proceeds: τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημεῖται δι' αὐτούς

(Rom. ii. 24)· ὁθεν γενναίως ὁ Ἀπόστολος, Ἐγραψα (obs.) ὑμῖν, φησὶν, ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ (obs.) μὴ κ.τ.λ. (1 Cor. v. 9). The coincidence in the use of διαστρέφειν (§ 46 in our Clem.) by the two Clements, as showing that they did not at this point write independently of one another, has been observed by Lightfoot and earlier editors. They conclude that Clem. Alex. copied our Clement. This is not the natural and obvious conclusion. Let us call the passage as it stands in Clem. Alex. A., and in our Clement B. If these two passages were put into the hands of a person ignorant of their history, we imagine that he would say that A. is giving a continuous citation, and that the διέσ-τρεψεν of B. is the recollection of the clause in which A. has διαστρέψαι,—a clause, however, which B. did not care to take. But when this coincidence, the force of which is acknowledged, is considered in connection with the other coincidences between the two Clements (which are not less noteworthy, and which tell their own tale), and with those between our Clement's passage and the forged excerpt from Agatharchides, *Theophrastus*, and Tatius, it seems necessary on any principles of fair criticism to conclude that the writer of Clement's Epistle copied from Clement of Alexandria; and, if a different person from the author of the excerpt, exercised a perverse ingenuity in extracting suggestions for his forged epistle, from an excerpt which was interpolated into Photius' *Bibliotheca*, long after Photius' times.

8. In *Orat.* iii. (quoted on p. 181) are the words ταύρους δὲ καὶ ἔλαφον ἀνελὼν ὧν μυξωτῆρες ἔπνεον πῦρ. Attention has been specially directed to these words, on the ground that, as Sylburg points out, the description given of the stag applies more properly to the bull. A parallel has been produced out of Phot. *Bibl.* 190¹ (*vid. sup.* p. 187). In *lib.* iv. 2, Tatius describes the hippopotamus as ἵππον δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦ Νείλου ἐκάλουν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι. καὶ ἔστι μὲν ἵππος, ὡς ὁ λόγος² βούλεται . . . μυκτὴρ ἐπὶ μέγα κεχληνώς, καὶ πνέων πυρώδη

¹ The words are ὅτι Νεῖλος (obs.) ὁ Ἑρακλῆς ἀπὸ γενεσίως φησιν ἐκαλεῖτο (obs.) ἐπεὶ δ' Ἦραν ἔσωσεν ἐπερχόμενον αὐτῇ ἀνελὼν τὸν . . . πυρίπνοον Γίγαντα, p. 147. Comp. with Tatius.

² Almost directly after the passage quoted from *Orat.* iii. we find the expression ὡς λόγος (*vid. sup.* p. 181). Comp. also ὁ στρατηγὸς (ὁ θεῖος λόγος) οὐ βουλίσαι σωμάτων ἀλκὴν κ.τ.λ., *Orat.* v. (quoted on p. 177). Tatius here describes the size, strength, etc., of the hippopotamus.

καπνον, a description very like that applied to the stag in the *Oratio*, and equally as appropriate. Diodorus has a description of the animal, and of the method of its capture, in *lib. i.* 35, p. 42. Tatius makes up his account, not as one might suppose, from this page of Diodorus, but from those pages which were used for the manufacture of the forged excerpts from Agatharchides. He uses, for example, *lib. iii.* 35, and transfers Diodorus' description of the (σαρκοφάγος) ταύρος (obs.) to the hippopotamus, as the writer of the *Oratio* does to the stag. Immediately above the description of the Echidna (*vid. sup.* p. 202), Eustathius mentions a marvellous beast τὸ μέγεθος ὅσον βοός, εἰκὸς τὸν τοῦ προσώπου τύπον ἐλάφω, καλούμενον τάρανδος, δυσθῆρατον, διὰ τὴν μεταβολήν. Like the chameleon, he says, it changed its colour (τὰς χροὰς τῶν τριχῶν). It may be that we have here the origin of the μεταβολή of which Sylburg complains, and in which Tatius seems to follow the writer of the *Oratio*. Comp. the ἐλάφω of Eustathius with the *Oratio*. Tatius has here, only two lines above the words quoted, μέγεθος δὲ κατὰ βοῦν τὸν μέγιστον, οὐρὰ βραχεῖα, καὶ ψιλὴ τριχῶν. Comp. with Eustathius.

9. Tatius not only describes the animal itself, but also the method¹ by which it is captured. He uses Ælian, *H. A.* v. 53, for one point, as the editors show, and proceeds:—

ἀπάτῃ δὲ ταύτῃ πάσχει τὴν ἄγρην. ἐπιτηρήσαντες γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰς διατριβάς, ὄρυγμα ποιησάμενοι, ἐπικαλύπτουσιν ἄνωθεν καλὰ μὴ καὶ χρώμασιν· ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν τῶν καλὰ μὴ μηχανὴν ἐστάναι κάτω ξύλινον οἶκημα, τὰς θύρας ἀνεφγμένον εἰς τὸν ὄροφον τοῦ βόθρου καὶ τὴν πτωσιν τοῦ θηρὸς λοχῶν· τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἐπιβάντα φέρεσθαι εὐθύς, καὶ τὸ οἶκημα φωλεῶς δίκην ὑποδέχεσθαι, καὶ τοὺς κυνηγέτας ἐκθορόντας εὐθύς ἐπικλείειν τοῦ πώματος τὰς θύρας, καὶ ἔχειν οὕτω τὴν ἄγρην, ἐπεὶ, πρὸς γε τὸ καρτερόν, οὐδεὶς ἂν αὐτοῦ κρατήσειεν βίᾳ· τὰ γὰρ ἄλλα ἐστὶν ἀλκιμώτατος, καὶ τὸ δέρμα, ὡς ὁρᾷτε, φέρει τραχύ, καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλει πείθεσθαι σιδήρου τραύματι, ἀλλ' ἔστιν, ὡς εἶπεν, ἐλέφας Αἰγύπτου. *iv.* 3.

As we have said above, Tatius uses, not *lib. i.*, where Diodorus expressly describes the hippopotamus and the method of its capture, but *lib. iii.*, where the elephant is spoken of. In the account of the elephant-hunters, given in § 26, we observe

¹ This, as well as the description, is found almost word for word in pseudo-Eustathius' *Hexæmeron*. A connection between this spurious treatise and several members of our "group of writings" will be pointed out in chap. vi.

παρατηροῦσι τῶν ἐλεφάντων τὰς εἰσόδους καὶ τὰς ἐκτροπάς. Compare. A few lines above, in § 25, we find σαρκοφαγοῦσι τὰ ληφθέντα, καὶ σπανίως μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλκιμωτάτων ζώων αὐτοὶ διαφθείρονται, τὰ δὲ πολλὰ δόλω (obs.) τὴν ἐκ βίας ὑπεροχὴν χειροῦνται. These words plainly suggest the “carnivorous bull,” as we shall see directly. Diodorus goes on to say that if the “hunters” lacked flesh, they cook the hides of beasts previously killed, and, singeing off the hair, τὰ δέρματα διαιροῦσι, καὶ κατεσθίοντες βεβιασμένως, πληροῦσι (ἀναπληροῦσι, v.l. obs.) τὴν ἔνδειαν (obs.) τοὺς δὲ ἀνήβους παῖδας γυμνάζουσιν ἐπὶ σκοπὸν βάλλειν, καὶ μόνοις διδόασιν τροφὴν τοῖς ἐπιτυχοῦσι (obs.). Comp. the words here specially marked out for observation with a passage from Tatius, given on p. 216, and which is compared with the language of Diodorus in *lib.* xvii. Diodorus’ τὴν ἔνδειαν here, Tatius alters into τὸ ἐνδεές, just as in the same clause he alters Diodorus’ ταῖς ἐμπειρίαις in *lib.* xvii. into τὸ ἔμπειρον. Diodorus says that the “hunters” used *stones* as well as darts in attacking their prey. Comp. with Tatius on p. 215. But this is not all, for the word ἐπιτηρήσαντες, which Tatius employs *there* as well as *here*, makes the use of Diodorus in both passages a matter of certainty.

It was pointed out on p. 100, when these pages of Diodorus were being compared with the excerpt manufactured out of them, that 1 Cor. xii. 11 seemed to be used in the words of the excerpt πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χρείαν ἕκαστος τὰ μέλη διαιροῦσιν. This last word is here among those just given out of Diodorus. A few lines below it we remark τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, a few lines above it διαπολεμοῦσι δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους . . . καὶ . . . διασπῶσι τοὺς χειρωθέντας. The most of these people die of hunger Diodorus goes on to say, ὅταν . . . τὸ σῶμα στερηθῇ τῆς ἀναγκαίας . . . χρείας. 1 Cor. xii. 11 might thus easily have been suggested to the writer of the excerpt; and that it was, will appear probable if we refer to the passage from Clem. *Ep.* i. 46, quoted on p. 221, and compare it with the words which we have just been giving out of Diodorus. Lightfoot refers to 1 Cor. xii. 12 in illustration of Clement. Observe also the language of Tatius given on the same p. 221, which also may be compared with 1 Cor. xii. 11.

We now turn to § 35, in which Diodorus gives an account of the “carnivorous bull:” ἔστι δὲ τὸ θηρίον ἀλκῇ τε καὶ

δυνάμει διάφορον, ὡς ἂν ἐπιτιθέμενον τοῖς ἀλκιμωτάτοις τῶν ζώων, καὶ τὴν τροφὴν ἔχων ἐκ τῆς τῶν χειρωθέντων σαρκοφαγίας. διαφθείρει (comp. with Diodorus' language in § 25, *vid. sup.* p. 224) . . . λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὸ δέρμα ἄτρωτον ἔχειν . . . οὐδένα κατισχυκέναι. τὸ δ' εἰς ὄρυγμα πεσόν, ἢ δι' ἄλλης ἀπάτης χειρωθέν . . . τῆς δὲ πάντων κρατίστης σιδήρου φύσεως οὐχ ἡττώμενον. Comp. with Tatius, quoted on p. 223. If we turn to Phot. *Bibl.* 250, c. xxxix., we find that the writer of the excerpt has abbreviated Diodorus. Some only of the coincidences just pointed out are there. For example, δέρμα is not there; nor is ἀπάτης, for which the writer substitutes δόλον, taking it apparently from Diodorus' § 25. We observe, however, in the excerpt ἀδρότερον, which Tatius uses in his description of the elephant (*vid. sup.* p. 220); and also the words σιδήρῳ δὲ οὐχ ὑπέικον, which, from a certain similarity of their own to the parallel words of Tatius, suggest that the same mind coined both expressions out of Diodorus. All the coincidences, indeed, which we have been finding between Diodorus and Tatius, are such as we should expect to find if the writer of the love story under Tatius' name was not a Greek but a late scholar, comparatively speaking, whose mind was stored with the language of Diodorus, as the mind of the compiler of the forged excerpts from Agatharchides would necessarily be stored. No "Alexandrine rhetorician," such as Achilles Tatius is thought to have been, could possibly have used a Greek author in the fashion that the writer of Tatius' love story has used Diodorus.

We have been particular in pointing out the use made of Diodorus, because we shall necessarily conclude from it that other authors were manipulated the same way, and that the whole of Tatius' Greek, given on p. 223, will be found on examination to be marked by those characteristics which we have already seen to belong to a portion of it. We may be perfectly certain that almost every word of it may be traced to a source, if only we look for that source with sufficient diligence.

In *Peregrin.* 32, in the sentence immediately preceding that which was just now (p. 219) illustrated out of Tatius' description of the elephant, the writer has μακρὰ χαίρειν φράσας θανατιῶντι σοφιστῇ (Proteus), τὸν ἐπιτάφιον ἑαυτοῦ πρὸ τελευτῆς διεξιόντι. *Ælian, Var. Hist.* iv. 6, speaks of Calanus as σοφιστῆς μακρὰ χαίρειν φράσας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. We had occasion to

refer just now (p. 220) to Tatius' account of the phoenix, which is, as we have said, close by in the last section of *lib.* iii. We find *σμύρνης γὰρ βᾶλον τῆς εὐωδεστάτης, ὅσον ἱκανὸν πρὸς ὄρνιθος ταφὴν, ὁρύττει τε τῷ στόματι, καὶ κοιλαίνει κατὰ μέσον, καὶ τὸ ὄρυγμα (obs.) θήκη γίνεται τῷ νεκρῷ. ἐνθὲς δὲ καὶ ἐναρμόσας τὸν ὄρνιν τῇ σορῷ, φέρει καὶ εἰς τὸ χάσμα γῆν' αὖ χάματι (obs.) ἐπὶ τὸν Νεῖλον. οὕτως ἵπταται τὸ ἔργον φέρων.* Comp. with Tatius' description of the trap for the hippopotamus. The next sentence is quoted on p. 220. Tatius proceeds, after three lines, *ἔρχεται δὴ τις ἱερεὺς¹ Αἰγύπτιος βιβλίον ἐξ ἀδύτων φέρων, καὶ δοκιμάζει τὸν ὄρνιν ἐκ τῆς γραφῆς. ὁ δὲ οἶδεν ἀπιστούμενος, καὶ τὰ ἀπόρρητα φαίνει τοῦ σώματος, καὶ τὸν νεκρὸν ἐπιδείκνυται, καὶ ἔστι ἐπιτάφιος σοφιστής.* Comp. the last two words with those of *Peregrin.* 32 just given. In *Peregrin.* 27, it is said that Proteus called himself Phoenix, because the Indian bird of that name was wont to ascend the funeral pyre. Presently the writer says, *μαρτύρομαι δέ, ἥ μὴν καὶ ἱερέας αὐτοῦ ἀποδειχθῆσθαι κ.τ.λ.* Comp. with Tatius. The writer of *Peregrinus* says, moreover, in the same place, *οἱ κατάρατοι δὲ οὗτοι μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ χρηστήριον, οἶμαι, καὶ ἄδυστον (obs.) ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ μηχανήσονται.* And in § 25, immediately after the passage quoted on p. 172, and which is still specially in hand, we find *εἰ μὴ, ὅπερ φασί, μηχανήσεται βαθεῖαν γενέσθαι καὶ ἐν βόθρῳ (obs.) τὴν πυράν.* And in § 21, it is said that Proteus was *βόθρον (obs.) ὁρύττων καὶ κ.τ.λ.* Comp. with Tatius' account of the phoenix and of the capture of the hippopotamus. There is an evident association of the phoenix with Proteus in the mind of our writers, and of the receptacle which the bird hollowed out with the receptacle which Proteus was said to intend to contrive in the funeral pyre. What is the origin of this joke? We have said on p. 172 that Calanus was taken by the writer of *Peregrinus* as the model, in many respects, for the death of Proteus. We have just seen that some words of Ælianus, said by him of Calanus, are applied in *Peregrinus* to Proteus. It is to Calanus that we must turn for the explanation of Proteus' secret receptacle.

In *lib.* xv. p. 717, Strabo tells us that the authorities which

¹ Comp. *οἱ οὖν ἱερεῖς ἐπισκίπτονται τὰς ἀναγραφὰς τῶν χρόνων καὶ εὐρίσκουσιν αὐτὸν πεντακοσιοστοῦ ἔτους πεπληρωμένου ἐληλυθέναι, Clem. Ep. i. 24.* We are not aware that any other writer mentions the inspection by the priest.

he consulted varied in their narratives of the manner of Calanus' end:—

ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν . . . γενομένης δὲ πυρᾶς καὶ τεθείσης ἐπ' αὐτῆς χρυσῆς κλίνης, κατακλιθέντα εἰς αὐτήν, ἐγκαλυψάμενον (obs.) ἐμπρησθῆναι· οἱ δὲ ξύλινον (obs.) οἶκον (obs.) γενέσθαι, φυλλάδος (obs.) δ' ἐμπλησθέντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς στέγης πυρᾶς γενομένης ἐγκλεισθέντα (obs.) . . . ῥίψαντα ἑαυτὸν ὥς ἂν δοκὸν συνεμπρησθῆναι τῷ οἴκῳ.

If we suppose that it occurred to our writer to make a pun upon the word *δοκόν*,¹ and to translate the closing words of Strabo by “as *seeming* or *pretending* to be burned along with the house,” the secret receptacle for the safety of Proteus would have an easy explanation. Nor does it seem possible to doubt that the joke arose in some such way, if we compare Strabo's words with Tatius' description of the capture of the hippopotamus, given on p. 223, and consider certain other coincidences which can be produced.

(1.) Attention was just now (p. 224) specially directed to *ἐπιτηρήσαντες*, which Tatius uses in the passage (*lib.* iv. 3) now under consideration. Two lines after this passage he has καὶ ἀκήκοα παρὰ τῶν ἀκριβῶς εἰδόντων τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ τὴν φύσιν ὥς παράδοξον. In *Peregrin.* 8, the writer, speaking of τὸ ἄγαλμα (Proteus) τὸ καυθισόμενον, says ἀκούσατέ (obs.) μου, ἐξαρχῆς παραφυλάξαντος τὴν γνώμην αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸν βίον ἐπιτηρήσαντος (obs.)· ἔνια δὲ παρὰ (obs.) τῶν πολιτῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπυνθανόμεν, καὶ οἷς ἀνάγκη ἦν ἀκριβῶς (obs.) εἰδέναι (obs.) αὐτόν. τὸ γὰρ τῆς φύσεως (obs.) κ.τ.λ. If due allowance be made for the cumulative force of the many coincidences which have been shown to exist between *Peregrinus* and *Tatius*, it seems impossible to deny that at any rate Proteus, the representative of Calanus, was in the mind of the writer of the passage from Tatius which we are examining.

(2.) We observe that Strabo's *φυλλάδος* is altered by Tatius into *καλάμη* and *καλάμων*. This invites us to examine the passage from the third Book of Maccabees, quoted on p. 173, which is so curiously connected with the passage from *Peregrin.*

¹ Leucippe twice *seemed* to die. Once she was sacrificed in parody of Iphigenia. On the second occasion the head of a woman, supposed to be Leucippe, was cut off. Tatius, in *lib.* vii. 5, alludes to τοῖς ψευδέσι θανάτοις ἐκείνοις, and says τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, ὅλον σου τὸ σῶμα· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν δοκῶν (obs.), μὴ ἔχων. Our writers took some interest in Docetism.

25 now in hand, and in which *καλάμους* is found. If we reflect for a moment, we see that Tatius' expression *τὴν τῶν καλάμων μηχανήν* exactly explains the device of the writer of 3 Macc. It was *ἡ τῶν (γραφικῶν) καλάμων μηχανή*. Nor is this all, for the expression of 3 Macc. *μηχανὴ τῆς ἐκφυγῆς* no less aptly expresses the device of which the writer of *Peregrinus* speaks immediately (obs.) after the passage connected with 3 Macc., whereby, as some suppose, Proteus was to explain death. This, of course, makes the coincidences between *Peregrinus* and 3 Macc., pointed out on p. 173, far more noticeable.

(3.) On p. 173 we referred, in illustration of 3 Macc., to Arr. *De Exped. Alex.* vii. 1. In the sentences referred to is the word *διατριβαί*. Tatius, as we see, has *διατριβάς*. Farther down, Arrian, who adopts Strabo's first version of the death of Calanus, has *οὐ μὴν δυνηθῆναί γε οὐδὲ τοῦ ἵππου ἐπιβῆναι* (obs.), *ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ κλίνης γὰρ κομισθῆναι φερόμενον* (obs.) κ.τ.λ. Comp. with Tatius, whose *καρτερόν* might have come from the same source (*vid. sup.* p. 173, note 2). If we look back to the close of *lib.* vi., we find that Arrian is there speaking of the tomb of Cyrus, and the repairs executed by Alexander. He uses the word *οἰκημα*. Comp. with Tatius. He uses also *πῶμα*, e.g. *καὶ τοῦ μὲν σώματος ὅσαπερ ἔτι σῶα ἦν, καταθεῖναι ἐς τὴν πύελον, καὶ τὸ πῶμα ἐπιθεῖναι*. Tatius uses *πῶμα*, as we see, in very much the same sense. Now there is not room even for the shadow of a doubt as to Tatius' use of Arrian. For in *lib.* iii. 15, where Leucippe is supposed to be sacrificed in parody of Iphigenia, we are told that the body of Leucippe, with its disembowelled false stomach, was laid in the coffin: *τὸ σῶμα ἐνθέντες τῇ σορῷ καταλείπουσι, πῶμα ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐπιθέντες*. Comp. with Arrian. Tatius goes on to say that Clitophon, who supposed Leucippe to be really dead, determined to destroy himself. He was prevented by the timely appearance of his friends, who laid hold on his hand. He exclaimed *πρὸς θεῶν μὴ μοι φρονήσητε θανάτου καλοῦ*. Arrian says that the inscription upon Cyrus' tomb ended with the words *μὴ οὖν φθόνει (φθονήσης v.l.) μοι τοῦ μνήματος*. It is very plain then that Tatius¹ *did* use Arrian in the passage which we are

¹ On p. 96, the use of Arr. *Exped. Alex.* vi. 20 in the forged excerpts from Agatharchides is pointed out.

considering. But if the use of Arrian is conceded, the use of Strabo can hardly be denied, and it would seem to be sufficiently proved that Tatius used more than one account of Calanus in his description of the capture of the hippopotamus.

(4.) We turn now to 3 Macc. We observe that the writer goes on, as Tatius does, to speak of elephants. Only a very few lines after the passage which we have quoted, he uses the word *πόμα*. Tatius, as we have seen, has *παῖμα*, a different word. Here again is a change in 3 Macc. very like the changes which mark the coincidences between 3 Macc. and *Peregrinus* (*vid. sup.* p. 173). In the same place 3 Macc. has *ἀραρότως*. The word is a rare one, and Suicer was able to say “Omittunt hoc adverbium Lexica.” It is used both by Diodorus and the excerpt in the description of the “carnivorous bull,” which we have shown to be used by Tatius in the passage before us. The word is not used in the LXX. except in 3 Macc., and Schleusner refers to Diodorus. Immediately after the passage containing the word *παῖμα*, Arrian has *καὶ τὴν θυρίδα δὲ ἀφανίσαι*, and then says that Alexander ἐστρέβλωσεν the guards of Cyrus’ tomb who had neglected their duty. In 3 Macc. iv. 14, a few lines, that is, above the passage quoted on p. 173, we find *στρεβλωθέντας δὲ ταῖς παρηγγελμέναις αἰκίαις τὸ τέλος ἀφανίσαι* (obs.) *μιάς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας*. The writer of 3 Macc. goes on to say that the scribes toiled on, sitting at their work from morning till night, for forty days. At the end of this time they were brought to the king (ver. 17), *μηκέτι ἰσχύειν τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπογραφὴν ποιῆσθαι διὰ τὴν ἀμέτρητον αὐτῶν πληθύν*. The description answers well to that given by Strabo of the Indian Sophists, who, whether they were standing, or sitting, or lying naked upon the ground, so remained until the evening, or who stood on one leg holding up a block of wood with both hands, and so remained throughout the whole day. Directly, speaking of Calanus, Strabo has (p. 716) *μηδὲν ἰσχύσει τῆς ὀφειλείας ἐπίδειξιν ποιήσασθαι*. Compare.

This chapter of 3 Macc. contains some other very noticeable points. Ver. 4 will be found to be illustrated in *Appendix A.* out of Diod. xvii. 31, p. 182. This is the first of those pages of Diodorus to which so many of our writings have been shown to be indebted (*vid. sup.* pp. 23, 74, 88, 216).

In ver. 6, the writer says αἱ δὲ ἄρτι πρὸς βίου κοινωνίαν γαμικὸν ὑπεληλυθυῖαι παστὸν νεάνιδες, ἀντὶ τέρφews μεταλλαβοῦσαι γόους . . . θρῆνον ἀνθ' ὕμεναίων κ.τ.λ., in ver. 7 δέσμιαι δὲ δημόσιαι μέχρι τῆς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἐμβολῆς εἵλκοντο, in ver. 8 ἀντὶ εὐωχίας καὶ νεωτερικῆς ῥαθυμίας τὰς ἐπιλοίπους τῶν γάμων ἡμέρας ἐν θρήνοις διηγόν, παρὰ πόδας ἤδη τὸν ἄδην ὄρῶντες κείμενον. The writer no doubt used, as Grotius points out, 1 Macc. i. In ver. 22, we remark τὰ σπονδεῖα καὶ τὰς φιάλας καὶ τὰς θυίσκας τὰς χρυσᾶς . . . καὶ τὸν κόσμον τὸν χρυσοῦν κ.τ.λ., ver. 23 καὶ ἔλαβε τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον. ver. 24 ἐποίησε φονοκτονίαν, ver. 26 τὸ κάλλος τῶν γυναικῶν ἡλλοιώθη, ver. 27 πᾶς νυμφίος ἀνέλαβε θρῆνον, καὶ καθημένη ἐν παστῶ ἐγένετο ἐν πένθει. If we turn to the lament over the dead Charicles, which has already (p. 210) been in our hands, we find νυμφίε μὲν ἀτελῇ, ἵππεῦ δὲ δυστυχῇ. τάφος μὲν σοι, τέκνον, ὁ θάλαμος· γάμος δὲ ὁ θάνατος· θρῆνος ὁ ὕμεναιος (obs.). ὁ δὲ κωκυτὸς τῶν γάμων οὗτος, ᾧ δαῖ . . . φιάλη γὰρ οὐκ ἦν χρησῇ (obs.), ἥ σπένδων . . . φαλάραις ἀργυραῖς, χρυσαῖς ἡνίαις. οἶμοι Χάριτλαις. ἐκόσμησά σοι τὸν φονέα χρυσῶ . . . ἔρριψας ἄστοργε τὸ κάλλος χαμαί. Compare. In lib. v. 9, Tatius has ἐνηχόμην τὸ ἐπίλοιπον τῆς ἡμέρας, οὐκέτ' ἔχων ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας· ἤδη δὲ κάμνων, and after five lines, which describe the opportune arrival of a ship, οἱ δὲ ἐφείλκυσάν με (into the ship) ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν τοῦ θανάτου πυλῶν· ἔπλει δὲ τὸ πλοῖον κ.τ.λ. Comp. with vv. 7, 8. Observe the ἤδη κείμενον of 3 Macc. and the ἤδη κάμνων of Tatius. 3 Macc. affords many examples of this kind of coincidence.

In ver. 10, the writer has τῶ καθύπερθε πυκνῶ σανιδάματι, and in ver. 11 τούτων δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν λεγομένην σχεδίαν ἀχθέντων. Grotius remarks "Multum falluntur qui σχεδίαν hic sumunt pro rate:—verum *Schedia* locus est in Ægypti parte inferiore quatuor Schoenis ab Alexandria, navale habens, ut nos docet Strabo libro xvii." Strabo, p. 800, has τὴν ἐπὶ Σχεδίαν ἄγουσαν. The so-called excerpts from Agatharchides in c. ix. take up the same passage of Strabo, and we observe οἱ δὲ Σχεδίαν καλοῦσιν (obs.). In the following column we find ἀχθῆ, and a few lines below, on the same page, τοῦ σανιδάματος with πυκνούς after two lines. Σανίδωμα is an uncommon word.

From the foregoing coincidences we must needs conclude that the "marvel" spoken of, 3 Macc. iv., is simply a joke.

It takes its rise apparently from Eccles. i. (e.g. ver. 15, *καὶ ὑστέρημα οὐ δυνήσεται ἀριθμηθῆναι*). The author uses Ecclesiastes after the same fashion as the writer of the *Evangelium Thomæ* (vid. sup. p. 42 sq.). Coincidences between 3 Macc. and the *Metaphrasis* of Gregory Thaumaturgus prove this to be the case. We must reserve these for some future opportunity, for an adequate discussion of them would occupy far more space than we can spare at the present time. One coincidence, however, which concerns the use of a word already noticed, we may point out. 3 Macc. v. 4 runs: *ὁ δὲ ἐλεφαντάρχης τὸ προσταγὲν ἀραρότως* (vid. sup. p. 229) *Ἑρμῶν συνετέλει*. In *Metaph.* i. 7, Gregory has *καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς εἰς τουτονὶ συντελοῦντα ἡμῖν τὸν βίον, οὕτως ἄραρε*. Hesychius does not give *ἀραρότως*, but he has *Ἀραρῶσαι* (*ἀραρότως* or *ἀραρῶς* is conjectured) *ἀρμοδίως προσηρμοσμένως*. *Ἀρμοζόντως, ἄσφαλῶς, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ἀραρῶς παγίως, δέδεικται*. A little above this Hesychius has *Ἀραρεν, ἡρμόσθη, ἢ παγίως δέδεται ἢ κέκριται*. Our conjecture that the *Evang. Thom.* and 3 Macc. go hand in hand in their jesting use of Ecclesiastes, seems to receive some confirmation from the fact that in *lib.* vi. 11 Tatius has *ἀνάστηθι καὶ θύε . . . Ἀφροδίτῃ μνημόνευε δὲ κάμοῦ*, which may be compared with very nearly the same words of the *Evang. Thom.* quoted on p. 62, and that in *lib.* v. 5, Tatius manifestly uses the *Aves* of Aristophanes to which the *Evang. Thom.* has been shown to be indebted (vid. sup. p. 66).

(5.) We have pointed out on p. 219 that some words applied in *Peregrinus* to Proteus are by Ælian applied to Calanus in *Var. Hist.* v. 6. Turning to Ælian, the eye falls upon the closing words of chapter v., which are very remarkable. The chapter consists of two sentences only. The first tells us that Epaminondas *ἕνα εἶχε τρίβωνα, καὶ αὐτὸν ῥυπῶντα*, and that when it was sent to the "wash," he was obliged to remain at home (in bed?) for the lack of another. The author of *Peregrinus* does not let this go by unnoticed. In § 36, he says that at the closing scene Proteus *ἀποθέμενος . . . τὸ τριβώνιον . . . ἔστη ἐν ὀθόνῃ ῥυπώσῃ ἀκριβῶς*. Tatius has the same thing in mind perhaps when he describes a woman as *ἐρρύπωμένη τὸ σῶμα, χιτῶνα ἀνεζωσμένη ἄθλιον πάνυ*. v. 17. He has *τὴν ὀθόνην* a few lines above in § 16, and again in § 24.

Ælian's second sentence informs us that Epaminondas refused to receive a large sum of money sent to him by the Persian king. Ælian adds καὶ εἴ τι ἐγὼ νοῶ, μεγαλοφρονέστερος ἦν τοῦ διδόντος ὁ μὴ λαβάν. This might have given Clement the first suggestion for his saying (*vid. sup.* p. 21) ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες (*Ep.* i. 2), and its connection with humility (πάντες τε ἑταπεινοφρονεῖτε κ.τ.λ.). Tatius again steps in to confirm the conjecture, for in *lib.* viii. 17, in his description of a wonderful reformation that had been wrought in a certain man, he says, τὸ μεγαλόφρον ἐφύλαττε πρὸς τοὺς ἐν χρεῖα τοῦ λαβεῖν διὰ πένιαν ὄντας.

Ælian's cap. 6 is on the voluntary death of Calanus. Among the first words are those to which we just now referred as being used in *Peregrinus* of Proteus. Ælian says that Calanus made the funeral pyre of all kinds of sweet-smelling wood, and describes him as ὁ περιληφθεὶς τῆς φλογός. The writer of *Peregrinus*, in the next sentence to that containing the mention of the "dirty shirt," says that Proteus cast in frankincense into the fire, and adds directly, ἀλλὰ περιεσχέθη ὑπὸ τῆς φλογός.

Ælian says also that Calanus, after his usual exercises (ἦν γὰρ αὐτὸ δρόμος) ἀνελθὼν ἐπὶ μέσης τῆς πυρᾶς ἔστη (*obs. cf.* Proteus in his "dirty shirt," *vid. sup.* 231) ἑστεφανωμένος καλάμου κόμη. καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἥλιος αὐτὸν προσέβαλλεν ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸν προσεκύνει. In § 39, the author of *Peregrinus* says that some people expected that Proteus would destroy himself in the early morning, ὥς πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα τὸν Ἥλιον ἀσπασάμενος (ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ τοὺς Βραχυμᾶνάς φασὶ ποιεῖν) ἐπιβήσεσθαι τῆς πυρᾶς. Compare. With Ælian's καλάμου κόμη, compare Tatius' καλάμη καὶ χώμασιν in the passage quoted on p. 223. The coincidence is of the same kind as those (χαρτηρία (3 Macc.) καρτερία (*Peregrin.*), πόμα (3 Macc.) πᾶμα (*Tat.*), κάλαμος (3 Macc.) Κάλανος (*Peregrin.*), ἀνίκητος (3 Macc.) ἀκίνητος (*Peregrin.*) ἀνέχονται (*Peregrin.*)) which have been pointed out on pp. 173, 229 (see also p. 230), and which are all connected together in the closest possible way. Nor does Tatius' joke here seem at all doubtful, for in *lib.* viii. 6 he has δρόμον (*obs.*) ἐρωτικόν, and after two lines καλάμων δὲ κόμην, and presently in the same section ἑστεφανωμένη τὴν κεφαλὴν πίτυος κόμαις. Compare.

(6.) We have mentioned (p. 223) that Tatius, immediately before the passage now in our hands, makes some use of Ælian, *H. A.* v. 53. Ælian has a second and very brief account in *H. A.* vii. 19 ἀσεβέστατον δὲ ὁ ποτάμιος ἵππος, γέυεται γὰρ καὶ τοῦ πατρός. This might have suggested one of the pseudo-Helladian jokes. Plato, it is said, called Aristotle a horse καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἵππος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φιλεῖ πατέρα δάκνειν (*vid. sup.* p. 53). A few lines below Ælian has εἰσέθορε (obs.) δ.ά τινος ἀνεωγμένης (obs.) θυρίδος (obs.). Comp. with Tatius (*vid. sup.* p. 223). Ælian's story is of an ape which, having been spectator when a child was being washed, watched its opportunity, jumped in through the open window, seized and stripped the child, and then poured hot water over it. If Tatius referred to Ælian's second mention of the hippopotamus, as we know he did to the first, in the composition of the passage before us, this is an indication of his researches such as we should expect to find.

(7.) We have seen (p. 227) that Tatius altered the οἶκον of Strabo into οἶκημα on the suggestion (p. 228) of Arrian. We may ask, however, why he uses οἶκημα in the sense of "cage" or "prison." Pseudo-Helladius (Cod. 279, p. 535) informs us. Speaking of the dislike of the ancients to use words of ill-omen, he says, διὸ καὶ τὸ δεσμωτήριον οἶκημα ἐκαλοῦν. He goes on to give the words quoted on p. 50 in illustration of the *Oratio*. The writer concludes his sentence on euphemisms by saying that some persons call the ape καλλίαν. We have just seen that Tatius seems to interweave the language of a story about the ape into the passage in which he uses οἶκημα in the sense of δεσμωτήριον. In *lib.* vi. 14, Tatius says that Clitophon's friends learning that he was shut up ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ . . . τῆς νυκτὸς εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὸ οἶκημα σπουδῇ παρῆσαν, καὶ ἤθελον μὲν αὐτοῦ καταμείναι σὺν ἐμοί (Clitophon). ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν δεσμῶν refused and sent them away. Clitophon said to them, however, εἰ παραγένοιτο (Leucippe), περὶ τὴν ἑω σπουδῇ πρὸς με ἔκειν. Comp. with pseudo-Helladius. Comp. also *Peregrin.* 12 . . . ἀλλὰ ξὺν σπουδῇ ἐγγίγνετο· καὶ ἔωθεν μὲν εὐθὺς ἦν ὁρᾶν παρὰ τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ περιμένοντα γραῖδια, χήρας τινάς, καὶ παιδία ὀρφανά· οἱ δὲ ἐν τέλει αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ., and presently ὦν ἥκόν τινες . . . παραμυθησόμενοι τὸν ἄνδρα (Clitophon's object in requesting his friends to bring him early tidings of Leucippe).

This very passage is placed in comparison with pseudo-Galen on p. 88. Pseudo-Galen's *περὶ τὴν ἔω* is here exactly found. Comparison of the three passages, one with another, suggests that all three were from the same hand.

10. Achilles Tatius, in *lib.* vi. 5, writes thus:—

ἄγει δέ με εἰς τὸ δεσμοκτήριον, καὶ παραδίδωσιν ἔγκλημα τῆς μοιχείας ἐπιφέρων. ἐμὲ δὲ ἐλύπει τούτων μὲν οὐδέν, οὐθ' ἡ τῶν δεσμῶν ὕβρις, οὐθ' ἡ τῶν λόγων αἰτία. καὶ γὰρ ἐθάῤῥουν τῷ λόγῳ περιέσεσθαι μὴ μοιχὸς εἶναι, γῆμαι δὲ ἐμφανῶς. δέος δέ με περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης εἶχεν οὐπω σαφῶς αὐτὴν ἀπολαβόντα· ψυχαὶ δὲ πεφύκασιν μάντις τῶν κακῶν, ἐπεὶ τῶν τε ἀγαθῶν ἥμιστα ἐκμαντείας εὐτυχοῦμεν.

With this passage, which we shall call A, comp. ἡδύνειν γὰρ πέφυκε τὴν ψυχὴν τὸ ἀγαθόν. "Οτι (showing a new excerpt) ὀργιζομένου ἐστὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πολλάκις λέγειν . . . διὸ ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων ὀργιζόμενος τῷ Κάλχαντι ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι τὴν βλασφημίαν περιφέρει, Μάντι, λέγων, κακῶν (Hom. *Il.* i. 106) κ.τ.λ., Phot. *Bibl.* 279 (pseudo-Helladian excerpts). It would be unreasonable to suppose this coincidence to have accidentally arisen. Besides, we have just seen that Tatius seems to use pseudo-Helladius, p. 535. We have, moreover (on p. 225), found good reason for supposing that Tatius was indebted to the forged excerpts from Agatharchides. We must therefore conclude that Tatius made use of Photius' *Bibliotheca*, and that therefore his love story cannot be the writing which is described in the *Bibliotheca*, unless the descriptions therein given are themselves only interpolations.

It must be observed that the passage from pseudo-Helladius just quoted has been already in great part given in a note on p. 82. It is there brought forward in support of the conjecture that pseudo-Galen, whose treatise we were then showing to belong to our "group of writings," had 1 Kings xxii. in his mind in a certain sentence which he was writing. Pseudo-Galen does not use the expression *μάντις τῶν κακῶν*, but he is speaking of prophets of evil things. If we turn to Tatius, we find an unmistakeable reference to Acts xx. 22 sq.: "And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city (*μάντις κακῶν*, e.g. Agabus in xxi. 11) λέγον ὅτι δεσμά με καὶ θλίψεις μένουσιν· ἀλλ' οὐδενὸς λόγον ποιοῦμαι (*sed nihil horum vereor.* Vulg.),

neither count I my life dear unto myself," etc. Tatius' γῆμαι ἐμφανῶς is a reference to *lib.* v. 14, where we find ἡ εἰς "Εφεσον ἡμῶν ἄφριξις answering to S. Paul's μετὰ τὴν ἄφριξιν μου (from the Ephesian elders) in ver. 29; and in § 15 τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ . . . τῇ δὲ Κλεινίᾳ ἐδόκει μὴ με καταλιπεῖν, ἀλλὰ μέχρις 'Εφέσου συμπλεύσαντα, καί τινα χρόνον διατρίψαντα τῇ πόλει, ἐπανελθεῖν κ.τ.λ. answering to τῇ ἐπιούσῃ in ver. 15, and ἔκρινε γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος παραπλεῦσαι τὴν "Εφεσον, ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ in ver. 16. Section 17 begins with πέντε δὲ τῶν ἐξῆς ἡμερῶν διανύσαντες τὸν πλοῦν ἤκομεν εἰς τὴν "Εφεσον. Comp. Acts xxi. 6 ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν πλοῦν διανύσαντες ἀπὸ . . . εἰς κ.τ.λ. There are many more coincidences between Tatius and the Acts of the Apostles, but these suffice to show that Acts xx. 22 was used by Tatius in connection with μάντις κακῶν. The conjecture which we hazarded with respect to pseudo-Galen thus receives some support out of Tatius. Pseudo-Galen himself, it will be remembered, makes use of the Acts of the Apostles.

Clitophon (in Tatius' passage above), it will be observed, gives, as S. Paul does, an example of ἀπάθεια. We should expect, from what we have seen, that our writer would look not merely at a notable passage in the Acts (as he does), but also, as Stephens would say, at some other "celebrem historiam," or "historici cujuspiam sententiam" (*vid. sup.* p. 16). On p. 97, we have pointed out that the compiler of the excerpts from Agatharchides paid more than ordinary attention to what Diodorus has to say in *lib.* iii. 18, p. 187, on the τὸ τῶν ἀπαθῶν Αἰθίοπων ἔθνος. If for that reason we turn to Diodorus, we find αἰτίας (obs.) . . . οὔτε γὰρ ξίφος σπασαμένου τινὸς καὶ καταφέροντος ὑπεξέφυγον, οὔθ' ὕβριν (obs.) οὔτε πληγὰς ὑπομένοντες ἡρεθίζοντο . . . οὔδεμίαν ἔμφασιν ὀργῆς ἢ πάλιν ἐλέους δίδόντες. In § 13, half a dozen lines above the passage quoted in illustration of οἴκημα, Tatius writes:—

σέψαι κατὰ σοῦ, τί ἄμεινον, καὶ ὅπως μηδὲν τούτων (obs. this note of connection with A), πρὸς Θέρσανδρον ἐρεῖς, καὶ μὴ παροξύνῃς χρηστὸν ἄνδρα. ὀργισθεῖς γὰρ ἀφόρητός ἐστιν· χρηστότης γὰρ τυγχάνουσα μὲν χάριτος, ἔτι μᾶλλον αὐξεται· προπηλακισθεῖσα δέ, εἰς ὀργὴν ἐρεθίζεται.

Comp. this passage, which we shall call B, with Diodorus. Now, observe, if we turn to the forged excerpt we find that the coincidences just given out of Diodorus have disappeared,

and instead we have οὔτε προπηλακισμῶ (obs.) ἐρεθίζεσθαι. Comp. with Tatius. There is no escape from this interesting coincidence. If Tatius (so-called) was the author of the excerpt, all is explained. If he was not, then he must have copied from the excerpt, and also from Diodorus, to whose narrative the excerpt is indebted. No other explanation is possible.

Another curious fact now appears. Wesseling on οὗθ' ὕβριν κ.τ.λ. says, "*Jo. Tzetzes Chiliad. vi. 742* (? 735) hæc in oculis habuit:" καὶ παύοντα τὰς ἀφορήτους θλίψεις. καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοὺς Αἰθίοπας τοὺς ἀπαθεῖς κ.τ.λ. Comp. Tatius' ἀφόρητος.

We have just come to the conclusion that Tatius either wrote or used the excerpt. In confirmation of this we shall refer to pseudo-Galen. He has προπηλακίζόμενος on p. 626, and ἡ πρὸς αὐτοὺς συνουσία in the next line but one. This last word is a very noticeable one,—not in Diodorus, for it is not there,—but in the excerpt. We find in the excerpts, some few lines above προπηλακισμῶ, the words πρὸς ᾧδαῖς ἀνάνθρωποις καὶ πρὸς ταῖς συνουσίαις (obs.) ταῖς παιδιᾶς (παιδείας, v.l.) χάριν γινομέναις, ὑπ' οὐδενὸς περισπώμενοι, διὰ τὴν εὐκοπίαν τῆς τροφῆς. There is a jest here which should have betrayed the falsity of these excerpts on the very first occasion of their being critically examined. Diodorus says (iii. 17) that the Ichthyophagi pursue their fishing for four days καὶ ταῖς ἀνάνθρωποις ᾧδαῖς ἀλλήλους ψυχαγωγοῦντες. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐπιμίσγονται ταῖς γυναιξὶν αἷς ἂν τύχωσι, παιδοποιίας ἕνεκα· πάσης ἀσχολίας ἀπολελυμένοι, διὰ τὴν εὐκοπίαν . . . τῆς τροφῆς (σὺν παιδιᾷ nine lines below). The writer of the excerpt takes the beginning and the end of Diodorus' sentence, and puts his own transparent joke in the middle. Pseudo-Galen observed this, for he has here . . . τῶν γενομένων· καὶ μὴ διὰ πάντος ἀσχολίαν. The excerpt has, not here, but presently (for a sufficient reason), γίνεται, πρὸς ἀσχολίαν, so that pseudo-Galen may be thought to have diligently compared the excerpt with Diodorus. Συνουσία is thus a very noticeable word.

Pseudo-Galen has here ἀναπνοή τε καὶ φωνὴ γίνεται. A jest underlies both these words.

(1.) Diodorus immediately proceeds: τῇ δὲ πέμπτῃ πρὸς τὴν ὑπάρειαν ἐπείγονται πανδημεῖ, ποτοῦ χάριν, ἐνθα συρρώσεις

γλυκέων ὑδάτων εἰσί, πρὸς αἷς οἱ νομάδες τὰς ἀγέλας τῶν θρεμμάτων ποτίζουσιν. ἡ δὲ ὁδοιπορία τούτων παραπλήσιος γίνεται (obs.) ταῖς ἀγέλαις τῶν βοῶν, πάντων φωνήν (obs.) ἀφιέντων οὐκ ἔναρθρον κ.τ.λ. The writer of the excerpt improves on this, for he says that these people go down on their knees and drink βοηδόν, οὐ πρὸς μίαν ἀναπνοῆς (obs.) ὀρμήν κ.τ.λ. Ἀναπνοή thus becomes a noticeable word.

(2.) In *Orat.* iii. (quoted on p. 181) Hercules is said ὄρη πηδῆσας ἵνα λάβῃ ὕδωρ ἔναρθρον (obs.) φωνήν (obs.) ἀποδιδόν, ὡς λόγος. Comp. with Diodorus, and observe his πρὸς τὴν ὑπάρειαν ἐπείγονται πανδημεί, ποτοῦ χάριν. We imagine that it occurred to the writer of the *Oratio* to substitute ὑπέρ for ὑπό, and to read πρὸς τὴν ὑπερορίαν instead of π. τ. ὑπάρειαν. The notion of jumping over the mountains would then immediately follow. Tzetzes, the scholiast on Lycophron, has an amusing passage, in which he says: "Little didst thou think, O Lycophron, that I was standing by thee when thou wast reading Hipponax!" And here we seem to be standing at the elbow of our writer and listening to his chuckle of delight as he wrote ὄρη πηδῆσας κ.τ.λ. We can prove, so far as a thing of this kind can be proved, that this joke arose in the way that we suppose.

We may observe here, in Diodorus, that ἀσχολίας and ὑπάρειαν are in succeeding lines. Photius (?) in Cod. 213 says that Agatharchides was an imitator of Thucydides. No doubt he was. In *lib.* viii. 72, Thucydides has καὶ τὴν ὑπερόριον ἀσχολίαν ἐς οὐδὲν πρᾶγμα κ.τ.λ. Some MSS. read ὑπερορίαν. The origin of the joke is thus very apparent. But, observe, the excerpt has πρὸς ἀσχολίαν καὶ μέριμναν οὐδενὸς (obs.) ἀποβλεπόντων αὐτῶν πρᾶγματος (obs.). With this coincidence to crown all, it would be unreasonable to deny the joke. Συνουσία, ἀσχολία, ἀναπνοή, and φωνή are thus, all of them, very noticeable words in connection with προπηλακισμῶ in the excerpt. It would be absurd to contend that accident only has brought them into close company with προπηλακίζειν in pseudo-Galen.

In Diodorus, on the same page, is the false reading σωρὸν ἀγαθῶν (ἀκανθῶν). In the *Oratio*, after a few lines we find σωρῶ τῶν κακῶν. In Tatius, a few lines above A, we observe σωρὸν ἀγαθῶν, while a few lines above B, Tatius has σωρὸν

ἄλλοτριῶν ἐγκωμίων. Leucippe is speaking in this last place to Sosthenes, whose name is mentioned. She says ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐδὲν μέλει τούτων. Comp. Acts xviii. 17 "Then all the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the judgment-seat." καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίανι ἔμελεν. In *lib.* viii. 15 τὸν Σωσθένην ἤγον ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας and ἐπὶ βασάνους.

The sentence of the *Oratio* having thus come before us, it will be well to examine it more closely. It is very short, still there is room in it for a glance at some "*celebrem historiam*." The most notable instance on record of procuring water, is no doubt the supply provided for the children of Israel in their journeyings. If we turn to those pages of Philo, out of which so many coincidences with our writings have already been produced (*vid. sup.* pp. 27, 90), we find a section devoted to a description of the joy of the Israelites at finding a certain well. Philo says καὶ γὰρ ἔτυχεν οὐ χερσὶν ἰδιωτῶν, ἀλλὰ βασιλέων, ἀνατετμησθαι φιλοτιμηθέντων ὡς λόγος, οὐ μόνον περὶ τοῦ φρέατος κατασκευὴν, ἢ ἐκ τῆς πολυτελείας βασιλικὸν φαίνεται τὸ ἔργον κ.τ.λ. Comp. with the *Oratio*, and note the ὡς λόγος. A few lines below, Philo has περιέσεσθαι exactly used in Tatius' passage A. The next word in Philo begins a sentence, quoted on p. 28, in illustration of Philostratus. Philostratus is there describing the Hercules spoken of in connection with the cutting through the Isthmus of Corinth. *Vid. sup.* p. 190, and observe the ἥπειρον ἀποτεμεῖν and the general parallel.

With the words of Philo just given, comp. from the pages of pseudo-Galen, which we have just been using, πιθήκαν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔφην δεῖσθαι τὴν ἀνατομὴν (obs.) ὁμοίως τε τὴν κατασκευὴν (obs.) ἐχόντων οὐ μόνον (obs.) τούτων τῶν ζώων, ἀλλὰ καὶ (obs.) καὶ πεζῶν σχεδὸν ἀπάντων· ὅσα δὲ φωνὴν ἔχει μεγάλην, ἐπιτηδεύοντα τῶν μικροφώνων εἶναι κ.τ.λ. Pseudo-Galen also uses here ἀνατέμνειν. We may think that pseudo-Galen has in his mind the articulate and inarticulate voices of Diodorus, the excerpt, and the *Oratio*.

11. We shall use Achilles Tatius to illustrate one other point to which attention has already been directed. It is one of very great interest.

On p. 204 sq., we had occasion to point out a certain connection between Clement's Epistles and Hippolytus' description

of the opinions and teaching of Justin the Gnostic, in the use of 1 Cor. ii. 9. The two epistles, though they are commonly supposed to have been written by different persons, are not independent of one another in their use of this text. Thus, on *Ep.* ii. 11, Lightfoot says that "the coincidence of two remarkable quotations," one of them being 1 Cor. ii. 9, "in this very chapter, which occur also in the first Epistle, besides other resemblances (*e.g.* § 3), seems to prove that our writer was acquainted with and borrowed from the genuine Clement." We have seen that both Epistles seem also to be connected with Hippolytus' account of Justin.

On Clement's use of 1 Cor. ii. 9 in *Ep.* i. 34, Lightfoot remarks :—

"It was, at all events, a favourite text with certain early Gnostic sects, who introduced it into their formula of initiation, and applied it to their esoteric teaching; see Hippol. *Hær.* v. 24, 26, 27; vi. 24. This perverted use of the text was condemned by their contemporary Hegesippus (as reported by Stephanus Gobarus in Photius, *Bibl.* 232), as contradicting our Lord's own words μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. In other words, he complained that they would restrict to the initiated few the knowledge which Christ declared to be laid open to all. But Stephanus Gobarus himself, writing some centuries later, and knowing¹ the text only as it occurs in S. Paul, is not unnaturally at a loss to know what Hegesippus means by this condemnation (οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι καὶ παθὼν μάτην μὲν εἰρήσθαι ταῦτα λέγει κ.τ.λ.)," p. 115.

The authorities for "the perverted use" of 1 Cor. ii. 9 by the "Gnostic sects," to whom Lightfoot appeals, are thus Hippolytus (*vid. sup.* p. 204) and Hegesippus at third hand. Some fragments of Hegesippus' writings survive, but nothing that contains the objection which Gobarus ascribes to him. The knowledge of Gobarus and his writings would seem to have been confined to Photius or the interpolator of his *Bibliotheca*. It is quite possible that Hegesippus never said anything of the kind. Something of ridicule or irony may be thought to lurk in the words οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι καὶ παθὼν, an expression

¹ Yet Gobarus, near the close of Cod. 232, refers to statements of Hippolytus, which are found in the work to which Lightfoot refers, and not in any other extant work or fragment from the pen of Hippolytus. It is not a sufficient answer to this to say that another statement which Gobarus ascribes to Hippolytus is not found in any one of the eight out of the ten books of the *Refutatio* which have survived.

near akin to οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως, which often implies a good deal more than it expresses. A connection between Clement's Epistles and Hippolytus has been observed, and we turn therefore with some interest to the excerpts from Stephanus Gobarus, or rather to the short summaries of the contents of Gobarus' book found in Phot. *Bibl.* 232.

The column (1096, Migne) in which the reference to Hege-sippus is found contains six summaries:—1. On "the situation of Paradise;" 2, on "Hegesippus and 1 Cor. ii. 9;" 3, on "punishment;" 4, on "corruption;" 5, on the question "whether ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν is the eighth or ninth;" 6, on "the nature of the Lord's body after His resurrection." The discussion of these subjects must have occupied a considerable space in Gobarus' volume, and any coincidences which we may find between this column and Clement's Epistles, in the neighbourhood of his use of 1 Cor. ii. 9, cannot have arisen from Gobarus' use of Clement.

1. Clement closes *Ep.* i. 34 with 1 Cor. ii. 9. He then says ὡς μακάρια καὶ θαυμαστά τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, and after two lines καὶ ταῦτα ὑπέπιπτεν πάντα ὑπὸ τὴν διάνοιαν ἡμῶν. Gobarus connects S. Matt. xiii. 16 μακάριοι (obs.) οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. with 1 Cor. ii. 9 in the second summary, and in the sixth he has καὶ μηδὲ ὑποπίπτον ἀφ᾽ ἧ.

2. Clement closes *Ep.* ii. 11 with 1 Cor. ii. 9. His remarks in § 12 have been given on p. 206, and a connection with Tatius in the expression "two bodies" has been pointed out on p. 208. In the sixth summary, to which we have just referred, Gobarus speaks of "two bodies," the natural and spiritual.

3. In *Ep.* ii. 14, which is only a continuation of the subject of § 12, we observe δηλοῦσα ἡμῖν ὅτι, ἐάν τις ἡμῶν τηρήσῃ αὐτὴν (obs.) ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ καὶ μὴ φθείρῃ (obs.). In the fourth summary, in a quotation (obs.) from Titus Bostrensis, we find εἰ δὲ ἐαυτὴν ἔφθειρεν with δῆλον ὅτι (introducing the excerptor's own remarks) after three lines. In Clement we have ὅτι ἐκκλησία ζωῶσα σῶμά ἐστιν Χριστοῦ . . . ἡ ἐκκλησία πνευματικὴ . . . ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ αὕτη ἀντίτυπός ἐστιν τοῦ πνεύματος. In the sixth summary (already twice referred to) we find ὅτι τὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα . . . καὶ πνευματικὸν . . . καὶ ὡς τὸ σῶμα ἔτερόν ἐστι . . . καὶ ἀντίτυπον.

It is well-nigh impossible that these coincidences can have accidentally arisen. We must remember the coincidences that have been shown between Clement and Hippolytus, and the fact that nothing would have been heard of Gobarus if it had not been for Photius' interpolated *Bibliotheca*. There is good ground for suspecting that the use of 1 Cor. ii. 9 is simply profane jesting.

The words in which Gobarus refers to this text are these:—

ὅτι τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα τοῖς δικαίοις ἀγαθὰ οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν, οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. Ἡγήσιππος μέντοι, ἀρχαῖός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικός, ἐν τῷ πεμπτῷ τῶν Ὑπομνημάτων, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι καὶ¹ παθὼν, μάτην μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα λέγει, καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταῦτα φαμένους, τῶν τε θείων Γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου λόγοντος· Μακάριοι κ.τ.λ., S. Matt. xiii. 6.

In *lib.* v. 11, Tatius writes:—

ἀκούετω (obs.) δὴ καὶ ὁ Κλεινίας. ἡ Ἀφροδίτη μέγα τούτῳ παρέσχευ (καὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτης χάριν αὐτῇ παρέσχον πρὸ σοῦ. *lib.* vii. 5, *vid. sup.* p. 218) ἀγαθόν (obs.), ὁ δ' οὐκ ἐθέλει λαβεῖν (obs. μάτην εἰρῆσθαι). γυναικα γὰρ ἐξέμηνεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν πάννυ καλήν, ὥστε ἂν ἰδὼν (obs.) αὐτὴν εἴποις ἄγαλμα,² Ἐφesiaν τὸ γένος, ὄνομα Μελίττην. πλοῦτος πολὺς, καὶ ἡλικία νέα. τέθνηκεν δὲ αὐτῇ προσφάτως ἀνὴρ κατὰ θάλατταν· βούλεται δὲ τοῦτον ἔχειν δεσπότην· οὐ γὰρ ἄνδρα ἐρῶ (obs. this addition to the good things offered for acceptance)· καὶ δίδωσιν ἑαυτὴν καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτῆς τὴν οὐσίαν. δι' αὐτὸν γὰρ δύο μῆνας νῦν ἐνθάδε διέτριψεν, ἀκολουθῆσαι δεομένη. ὁ δὲ οὐκ οἶδα τί παθὼν (obs. all these words) ὑπερφηανεῖ, νομίζων αὐτῷ Λευκίππην ἀναβιώσεσθαι. § 12. καὶ ὁ Κλεινίας· οὐκ ἀπὸ τρόπου δοκεῖ μοι, φησὶν, ὁ Σάτυρος λέγειν. κάλλος γάρ, καὶ πλοῦτος, καὶ ἔρως εἰ συνῆλθεν ἐπὶ σε, οὐχ ἔδρας³ οὐδ' ἀναβολῆς. τὸ μὲν γὰρ κάλλος ἡδονήν, ὁ δὲ πλοῦτος τρυφήν, ὁ δὲ ἔρως αἰδῶ. μισεῖ δὲ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀλαζόνας. φέρε πείσθητι⁴ τῷ Σατύρῳ, καὶ ἰδρυσαι τῷ θεῷ.

¹ "Om. B.," Migne.

² Comp. καὶ ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι, ζῶν ἄγαλμα, καὶ βασιλείας ἀνδριάντα, κόσμιον τῷ ὄντι καὶ βασιλικὸν εἰς κάλλος ἄφραστον καὶ ἀμήχανον ἀπαξίσας, and after six lines ἐν ἀναβολαῖς, Niceph. *Dedic. H. E.* p. 5; ἢ ἐν σοί τινα ἰδρυσιν, p. 8, with ἔδραν in the next line, and after nine lines ζῶν ἀρετῆς ἄγαλμα σιαυτὸν παρέσχεες. Comp. with Tatius. A number of coincidences between this *Dedicatio* of Nicephorus and some members of our group of writings will be given in the next chapter.

³ "E. Bacchylide hæc ducta," Mitsch. See the preceding note.

⁴ This sentence has a ring in it which resembles Clement of Alexandria. It reminds us of the close of the *Oratio*, which is indebted to Clem. Alex. *vid. sup.* p. 178, where, in the note, a parallel will be found for Tatius' words here. Half a dozen lines above Clement's ἰδρύσῃ τὸν Θεόν, we remark σωθῆναί σε ἐπιίγομαι. Tatius after two lines has ἐπιίγουσα.

The words οὐκ οἶδα τί παθάν, which form the verbal coincidence with Gobarus, are not simply such as the writer would naturally employ. In § 21, the lady herself offers all that is here implied. Her favours are, however, again declined by Clitophon, who excuses himself by saying ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδα τί πέπονθα, νόσος (ὑπέτεινον τῆς νόσου τὴν ὑπόκρισιν) γάρ μοι ἐξαίφνης ἐνέπεσεν. It is evident, then, that the words in question are mere jest. And with this jest before us, forming as it does the coincidence with Gobarus' remarks upon the use of 1 Cor. ii. 9, is it possible to doubt that the whole passage in Tatius is intended as a parody upon that text? Besides, Tatius here plainly jests upon Jas. iv. 6. We can show that in the use of that text Tatius is in the closest possible contact with Clement, whose connection with Gobarus has been already shown.

Tatius uses ὑπερηφανεῖ in the sense of "despise" or "reject." This makes the resemblance to Gobarus more close. He, perhaps, remembered Luc. *Nigrin.* 31 τὸ δὲ ἐν καιρῷ . . . ὡς εὐτέλεις ὑπερηφανοῦντας. In the same sentence Lucian has τούτους γὰρ εἶναι τοὺς τὸ πολυτελὲς ὄψον ἀνουμένους, καὶ τὸν οἶνον κ.τ.λ. Tatius has presently, in § 13, ποῖον γὰρ ὄψον, ἔφη, μοι πολυτελές; ἢ ποῖος οἶνος τιμιώτερος τῆς σῆς ὄψεως; In the preceding sentence Lucian has εἰκάξειν ἡξίου, an expression used in *Peregrin.* 25, in a sentence which contains the word κενοδόξους, and in which the vainglory of the Brahmins is the uppermost idea. Tatius would appear to have been pondering the meaning and use of this and kindred words, for he is, as we have said, plainly indebted to Jas. iv. 6 μείζονα δὲ δίδωσι χάριν· διὸ λέγει, ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσι χάριν. Comp. Tatius' μισεῖ κ.τ.λ., and obs. his ἐαυτὴν (χάριν) καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτῆς τὴν οὐσίαν (μείζονα χάριν). With Tatius' use of χάριν in *lib.* vii. 5 (quoted above) before us, we cannot doubt the parody. Clement closes § 34 with 1 Cor. ii. 9. In the opening sentences of § 35, we have shown coincidences with Gobarus. Clement goes on to use (in his own fashion) Rom. i. 29 sq., and has ἀπορρήψαντες ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀνομίαν . . . ψιθυρισμούς τε καὶ καταλαλιάς, θεοστυγίαν, ὑπερηφανίαν (obs.) τε καὶ ἀλαζονείαν (obs.), κενοδοξίαν (obs.) τε καὶ ἀφιλοξενίαν. ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πράσσοντες στυγητοὶ (obs.) τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν. Comp. with Tatius. The circumstances

under which these coincidences are found should be carefully observed.

In illustration of the passage from Tatius given above, we have quoted some words from *lib. vii. 5*. The whole sentence is this, τὸ δὲ τῆς Μελίττης πεφόνευκέ σε πειρατήριον. ὁ δὲ ἀνόσιος καὶ ἄσεβης ἐγώ, τὴν ἀνδροφόνου σου κατεφίλησα πολλάκις, καὶ συνεπλάκην μεμισασμένας συμπλοκάς, καὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτης χάριν αὐτῇ παρέσχον πρὸ σοῦ. In *Ep. i. 30*, Clement has φεύγοντες . . . μιαιράς (obs.) τε καὶ ἀνάγνους συμπλοκάς (obs.) . . . βδελυκτὴν ὑπερηφανίαν. Θεὸς γὰρ, φησὶν, ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. Κοληθῶμεν οὖν ἐκείνοις οἷς ἡ χάρις ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ δέδοται. ἐνδυσάμεθα τὴν ὁμόνοιαν . . . ἀπὸ παντὸς ψιθυρισμοῦ καὶ καταλαλιᾶς πόρρω ἑαυτοὺς ποιοῦντες, ἔργοις δικαιοῦμενοι καὶ μὴ λόγοις. λέγει γάρ· Job xi. 2, 3. Ὁ ἔπαινος ἡμῶν ἔστω ἐν Θεῷ καὶ μὴ ἐξ αὐτῶν, αὐτεπαινετοὺς γὰρ μισεῖ ὁ Θεός. Comp. Tatius' μισεῖ ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ. Observe Clement's use of Jas. iv. 6, and in his ἀπὸ παντὸς κ.τ.λ. the plain connection with his § 35, where the other parallel with Tatius is found. After seven lines Tatius has δοκῶ δὲ εὐρηκέναι τοῦ θανάτου καλλίστην ὁδόν, δι' ἧς οὐδὲ ἡ θεοῖς ἐχθρὰ Μελίττη παντάπασιν ἁθῶος ἀπαλλάσσεται. Comp. here with Clement's *στυγητοὶ τῷ Θεῷ* in § 35 (just quoted). Tatius' language appears to be borrowed from Jas. iv. 4 ἐχθρα τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . ἐχθρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comp. also with Tatius the opening words of Clement's § 36 αὕτη ἡ ὁδὸς ἐν ᾗ εὐρομεν τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. (*vid. sup. p. 22*).

Clement quotes, as we see, Job xi. 2, 3. Ver. 4 runs μὴ γὰρ λέγει, ὅτι καθαρὸς εἰμι τοῖς ἔργοις, and ver. 14 εἰ ἄνομόν τί ἐστιν ἐν χερσὶ σου, πόρρω ποιήσον αὐτὸ ἀπὸ σοῦ. Comp. with Clement. It would seem, then, that he paid some attention to the verses adjoining those which he quotes. There are twenty-two verses in Job x. In ver. 14 we find ἁθῶον, in ver. 17 ἐπήγαγες δὲ ἐπ' ἐμὲ πειρατήρια, in ver. 19 οὐκ ἀπηλλάγην. Comp. with Tatius.

No one, we should suppose, will now venture to deny that Tatius made use of Jas. iv. 6, or that his love-story is very closely connected with Clement's Epistle. When, then, all the circumstances of the case are considered,—this parodical use of S. James, this connection with Clement (at a point where Clement uses 1 Cor. ii. 9), and of Clement (at that point)

with Gobarus, the general parallel to the verse of Scripture, the verbal coincidence with Gobarus' remarks upon that verse, —we must hold it to be sufficiently proved that Tatius wrote that portion of *lib.* v. 11, which is quoted above, in parody upon 1 Cor. ii. 9. This circumstance does not *prove* that the excerpts under the name of Gobarus are not genuine, but it does cast great doubt upon them. It is not easy to understand why the writer of Clement's Epistles should take such an interest in Hippolytus' and Gobarus' use of 1 Cor. ii. 9, nor why Tatius should seize upon a certain expression, if these writers were not aware of some jesting in Gobarus' remarks generally, and in the expression in particular on which Tatius lays hold. We believe that we can show the history of the jest, at least so far as the particular expression οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι παθὼν is concerned.

In *H. E.* iii. 36, Eusebius speaks of the epistles of Ignatius, and gives some short extracts from some of them. He was, it appears, greatly struck by certain words (λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἄσώματον) ascribed by Ignatius to our Lord, the source of which he could not recognise. Jerome, however, supplies the source (*Evangelium Hebræorum*) in his account of Ignatius in *Vir. Illustr.*, and also in the preface to *lib.* xviii. of his *Commentaries* upon Isaiah. With this apocryphal gospel Eusebius was, however, familiar. He refers indeed to its contents in cap. 39. This fact marks out the words of Ignatius as noticeable, and creates a certain parallelism between them and 1 Cor. ii. 9, as commented upon by Gobarus. Now, between Eusebius and Gobarus there is here a curious coincidence. Eusebius says, ὁ δ' αὐτὸς Σμυρναίοις (§ 3) γράφων, οὐκ οἶδ' ὁπόθεν (obs.) ῥητοῖς συγκέχρηται κ.τ.λ. Comp. Gobarus' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι παθὼν μάτην μὲν εἰρήσθαι ταῦτα λέγει κ.τ.λ. We believe that we can give good reason for supposing that we have here in Eusebius' words the origin of the joke in Gobarus'.

We have already seen that Gobarus speaks of the nature of the Lord's body after His resurrection, and inquires whether it could be touched. Ignatius says that the disciples ἤψαντο and believed. This gives us at once a second point of contact between Gobarus and Ignatius. Gobarus proceeds ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἀπέθετο τὴν σάρκα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ

τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν δεξιᾷ καθέζεται τοῦ Πατρός· καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ὡς ἐλεύσεται μὲν κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, οὐκέτι δὲ σάρκα ἔχων, ἀλλὰ θεοειδέστερον σῶμα. ὅτι οὐ μετὰ σαρκός, ἀλλὰ γυμνῇ τῇ θεότητι κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν παρουσίαν ὁ Δεσπότης παραγίνεται. Then follow some remarks of Photius', and presently ὅτι ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος ὅλος ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ παντὶ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸ πᾶν, καὶ ὅλος ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὃ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἤγνωσεν ἑαυτῷ· καὶ ἀπλῶς ἡ τῆς θεότητος οὐσία καὶ φύσει κ.τ.λ. ὅτι οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ δαίμονες σώμασιν ἤνωνται . . . ὅτι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν δαιμόνια γίνονται, καὶ τούναντίον, ὅτι ἄσαρκοι ὄντες κ.τ.λ. Earlier, Gobarus says that the angels are ἀσώματοι, and he uses ἀνθρωπόμορφον three lines above. Comp. with Ignatius as quoted by Eusebius. If we turn to *Smyrn.* (obs.) 3, we find as the closing sentence μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ ἠνωμένος (obs.) τῷ Πατρί. In the third line of § 4, Ignatius has ἀνθρωπομόρφων. If, now, we turn to the interpolated version, we find in lieu of Ignatius' sentence, οὐ μὴν δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐπιδεῖξαι ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἀληθῶς ἀλλ' οὐ τῷ δοκεῖν ἐγγήγερται καὶ συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ συνέπιεν . . . καὶ οὕτω σὺν τῇ σαρκὶ (obs.) . . . ἀνελήβη πρὸς τὸν ἀποστείλαντα αὐτόν, σὺν αὐτῇ (obs.) πάλιν ἐρχόμενος μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως, φασὶ γὰρ τὰ λόγια· Οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . οὕτως ἐλεύσεται (obs.) κ.τ.λ. (Acts i. 11). εἰ δὲ ἄνευ σώματός φασιν ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος . . . ἀσωμάτων (obs.) γὰρ οὔτε εἶδος, οὔτε χαρακτὴρ ἐστίν . . . διὰ τὸ ἀπλοῦν (obs.) τῆς φύσεως, with ἀνθρωπομόρφων after three lines in § 4. Gobarus may thus be thought to have used both versions of Ignatius. The interpolator appears to "look," as Gobarus certainly does, at Heb. i. 3, where alone in the N. T. *χαρακτήρ* is found.

At the close of § 2, the interpolator speaks of the brazen serpent as a type of Christ, in which he is followed presently by Gobarus.

We turn to Jerome's preface to *lib. xviii. Comment. in Isa.* He speaks of the diversity of opinion which prevailed on many religious questions. Gobarus' work, if it was ever written, could have been little more than a catalogue of such differing opinions. He quotes the words (*incorporale dæmoniam*) of which Eusebius speaks, and immediately quotes, as the interpolator of Ignatius also immediately does, S. Luke xxiv. 38, 39,

and S. John xx. 27. He then says "Denique ad probandam corporis veritatem, sumpsisse scribitur cibos," etc. Comp. with the words of the interpolated version quoted above. Jerome then says "Non quo post resurrectionem manducemus et libamus, ut millarii nostri volunt," etc. Gobarus has ὅτι πρότερον οἱ δίκαιοι ἀναστήσονται, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντα τὰ ζῶα, καὶ ἐπὶ χίλια ἔτη τρυφήσονται ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες κ.τ.λ.

Eusebius in the same place also quotes two short passages from Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans. One of these—ὅτι σῆτος εἰμι Θεοῦ, καὶ δι' ὁδόντων θηρίων ἀλήθομαι, ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄρτος εὔρεθῶ—Eusebius quotes from Irenæus v. 28. Almost immediately above this in Irenæus there is a passage explaining the six days of the creation and the seventh day of rest as a prophecy of things to come: φανερόν οὖν, ὅτι ἡ συντέλεια (cf. with the interpolated Ignatius) αὐτῶν τὸ εἶς ἔτος ἐστίν. The Greek¹ of the whole passage is found in "Cod. 3445 (2215) *Biblioth. Reg. Par.*" The ms. proceeds, as if still quoting Irenæus, καὶ τῇ ζ' κρίνει τὴν οἰκουμένην καὶ τῇ η', ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν, τοὺς μὲν παραδίδωσιν εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, τοὺς δὲ εἰς ζώην. The third summary (*vid. sup.* p. 240) from Gobarus' volume, that is, the one next following the mention of Hege-sippus, begins with ὅτι οἱ ἐν τῇ κολάσει παραδιδόμενοι τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν κ.τ.λ.; and the fifth runs thus: ὅτι ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν ὁ γδοός ἐστι καὶ τὸ ἀντικείμενον, ὡς οὐκ ὁ γδοός, ἀλλ' ἕνατος. Compare.

The coincidences which have been pointed have not been accidentally found, and cannot have accidentally arisen. It seems perfectly plain that the compiler of the so-called excerpts from Gobarus derived his οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι παθῶν from Eusebius, and that he paid special attention to those passages from Ignatius and Irenæus to which Eusebius refers. The excerpts are not what they pretend to be, summaries of the contents of a genuine work, but manufactured, as they stand in the pages of Photius' *Bibliotheca*, after the same fashion as the so-called excerpts from Agatharchides and Helladius. This is to some extent confirmed by the fact that Clement in *Ep.* i. 34, before citing 1 Cor. ii. 9, writes ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἐργάτης μετὰ παρρησίας λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον τοῦ ἔργου αὐτοῦ . . . δέον

¹ Quoted in Cotel. *Patr. Apost.* Barn. 15.

οὗν ἐστὶν προθύμους ἡμᾶς εἶναι εἰς ἀγαθοποιῶν. Comp. with the saying of Ignatius quoted by Irenæus, also with Ignat. *Polyc.* 7 (*vid. sup.* p. 22). It must also be observed that Nicephorus, in *H. E.* iii. 16, while greatly altering Eusebius' language, still preserves his οὐκ οἶδ' ὁπόθεν, and that he speaks, as Eusebius does not, of μηδέν τι τοῦ προσήκοντος φρονήματος. Gobarus in the third summary, to which we have just referred, has ἀληθὲς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας φρόνημα, οὐδεὶς κ.τ.λ.

In our next chapter we shall discuss Phot. *Bibl.* 126. The reason of the interest shown in this portion of Eusebius' history will then be apparent.

It will not be necessary to carry the investigation into Achilles Tatius' love-story any further. On p. 211, we promised to produce out of it illustrations of a great number of matters in connection with *Peregrinus* and other writings, to which attention had previously been directed. This promise has been fulfilled. The various writings previously examined have come up again, and point after point has had fresh light cast upon it. These various writings have been shown to be more or less closely connected with *Peregrinus*,—we could, had we been so minded, have started the examination of each of them from its pages,—and now we have found them to be woven like threads into the web of Achilles Tatius' love-story. We also promised to prove this story to be indebted to the *Bibliotheca* of Photius. We have done this, not in one instance only, but again and again. It cannot, therefore, be the writing described in the *Bibliotheca*, unless such description is an interpolation, or the *Bibliotheca* a fraud from beginning to end. This is not the place to sum up the evidence against the various members of the group of writings which we have been examining, for several of them will come before us again before we have completed our task. Still, would it not seem as if Lucian, and Clement, and Galen, etc., were but so many "aliases," and the love-story of Achilles Tatius only another shape which it pleased our literary Proteus to assume? The description of Achilles, given by Suidas, agrees well with this conclusion. He speaks of him as an Alexandrian, the writer of a love-story, a Christian and a bishop, the author of works upon the sphere and etymology, and of a volume of miscellaneous histories of many and great and wonderful men.

CHAPTER VI.

PHOTII BIBLIOTHECA.

WE believe that we have sufficiently fulfilled the promise made in chap. i. to prove “that literary frauds of some magnitude have been actually perpetrated.” It remains for us, however, to connect these frauds with the times of the revival of learning. This, then, is the main object of this chapter. It will not be necessary to trace each one of the writings which have been more or less closely examined down to the fifteenth century or thereabouts. They are all so intimately connected together, that if we can show satisfactorily that one or two of them are of very late date, we shall have fulfilled the purpose of this volume, which is to show the existence of frauds, not to settle the many and difficult questions which are connected with them. We are acquainted with several ways in which this may be done. We shall select that which will least of all raise up new questions for inquiry, and which will most of all support the conclusions at which we have already arrived. We shall therefore choose Photius’ *Bibliotheca* for further investigation. To it all our writings are related, and it will be well once again to test its integrity. Out of the *Bibliotheca* we shall select Codices 126, 244 ; Cod. 126, because it gives a description of Clement’s Epistles, and by testing the genuineness of the description, we shall be once more testing the genuineness of the epistles themselves ; Cod. 244 (excerpts from Diodorus), because we have declared it to be false, but have not yet fully proved it to be so.

§ 1.

Cod. 126.

Ἀνεγνώσθη βιβλιδάριον ἐν ᾧ Κλήμεντος Ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς Κορινθίους β' ἐνεφέροντο, ὧν ἡ πρώτη δι' αἰτίας αὐτοῦς ἄγει, στάσει καὶ παραχαῖς καὶ

σχίσμασι τὴν πρέπουσαν αὐτοῖς εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμόνοιαν ἐμπολιτεύεσθαι λύσαν-
τας, καὶ παραινεῖ παύσασθαι τοῦ κακοῦ. Ἀπλοῦς δὲ κατὰ τὴν φράσιν
καὶ σαφής ἐστι καὶ ἐγγυὲς τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ καὶ ἀπεριέργου χαρακτῆρος.
Αἰτιάσεται δ' ἂν τις αὐτὸν ἐν ταύταις ὅτι τε τοῦ Ωκεανοῦ ἔξω κόσμους
τινάς ὑποτίθεται εἶναι, καὶ δεύτερον ἴσως ὅτι ὡς παναληθεστάτῳ τῷ κατὰ
τὸν φοίνικα τὸ ὕρνεον ὑποδείγματι κέχρηται, καὶ τρίτον ὅτι ἀρχιερέα καὶ
προστάτην τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐξονομάζων, οὐδὲ τὰς θεοπρε-
πεῖς καὶ ὑψηλοτέρας ἀφῆκε περὶ αὐτοῦ φωνάς· οὐ μὴν οὐδ' ἀπαρακα-
λύπτως αὐτὸν οὐδαμῇ ἐν τοῦτοις βλασφημεῖ. Ἡ δὲ δευτέρα καὶ αὐτὴ
νουθεσίαν καὶ παραινέσιν κρείττονος εἰσάγει βίου, καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ Θεὸν τὸν
Χριστὸν κηρύσσει, πλὴν ὅτι ῥητά τινα ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς θείας Γραφῆς ξενίζοντα
παρεισάγει· ὧν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη ἀπήλλακτο παντελῶς. Καὶ ἐρμηνείας δὲ
ῥητῶν τινων ἀλλοκότους ἔχει. Ἀλλως τε δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς νοήματα
ἐρριμμένα πως καὶ οὐ συνεχῇ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν ὑπῆρχε φυλάττοντα.

Ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ βιβλιδιάρῳ ἀνεγνώσθη καὶ Πολυκάρπου Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς
Φιλιππησίους, γέμουσα πολλῆς νουθεσίας μετὰ σαφηνείας καὶ ἀπλότητος
κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν τῆς ἐρμηνείας τύπον. Λέγει δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπισ-
τολάς αὐτοῦ Ἰγνατίου τοῦ θεοφόρου ἀπεσταλκέναι, καὶ αἰτεῖται ἀναδιδά-
χθῆναι παρ' αὐτῶν εἴ τι περὶ ἐκείνου διακούσαιεν.

1. Our attention is first of all arrested by the words οὐ μὴν
οὐδ' ἀπαρακαλ. κ.τ.λ. For the form in which the sentence is
cast, comp. pseudo-Helladius (Cod. 279), p. 531 οὐ μὴν ἀλλ'
οὐδὲ φαίνεται Ὁμηρος ἀλλαχοῦ χρησάμενος τῇ φωνῇ. He adds
almost immediately καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ἐστὶ ξενίζοντα (obs.) ἐν τοῖς
Ὁμήρου. It is not, however, the form of the sentence which
specially deserves attention, but its emphatic protestation that
Clement does not in anywise openly blaspheme. This is surely
a marvellous sentence in the mouth of Photius, who in Cod. 113
identifies Clement of Rome with the Clement of Phil. iv. 3,
and pronounces his first Epistle to the Corinthians to be ἀξιό-
λογον, and informs us that it was at one time so highly esteemed
that it was read in public. The sentence before us loudly
protests, but its protestations only give emphasis to the word
ἀπαρακαλύπτως, and point out its irony. The word itself is
somewhat rare. It occurs in Just. *Dial.* 76. Photius here,
as we see, complains of the apocryphal quotations found in
Clement's second epistle, and, in a less degree, in his first. A
quotation of this kind, found in *Ep.* i., has been examined and
its falsity exposed (*vid. sup.* p. 136 sqq.). In *Appendix B*, an
apocryphal quotation from *Ep.* ii. is similarly dealt with, and
it is there shown that Just. *Dial.* 76 was used in the manu-
facture. Justin's string of inaccurate quotations from the

gospels, of which the writer of *Ep.* ii. makes use, is ushered in by the words οὗτος μόνος ἀπαρακαλύπτως (obs.) ἐδίδαξεν. The word may have been selected by the writer of Cod. 126, with an ironical reference to this apocryphal quotation.

In the next place, we must point out that there seems to be a far closer connection between *Peregrinus* and Cod. 126 than we have any right to expect between two writings on such totally different subjects.

(1.) In *Peregrin.* 24, the writer says τὸν οὖν Θεαγένη τοῦτο μάλιστα αἰτιάσαιτο (obs.) ἄν τις, ὅτι (obs.) τᾶλλα (obs.) ζηλῶν τᾶνδρός, οὐχ ἔπεται τῷ διδασκάλῳ. Photius complains of the application of the word προστάτης to our Lord (the "Master"). This word is used in *Peregrin.* 11, in a passage which has a parallel in Cod. 279, where pseudo-Helladius speaks of "opposing the Master" (*vid. sup.* p. 53). The close connection between *Peregrin.* §§ 11, 24, can be shown, but the limits which we have assigned to ourselves for this volume will not allow of the discussion of this point, which is not very material to the general argument (*vid. sup.* p. 47). As the case stands, however, compare the words just given from *Peregrin.* 24 with Cod. 126, and observe not only the verbal coincidences, but the parallel which lies behind.

(2.) On p. 36, a coincidence between *Peregrin.* 41 and Cod. 126 is pointed out. The words of *Peregrinus* are these: . . . Ἑλλήνων, οἷς καὶ ἐπεσταλκέναι (obs.) ἔλεγον (obs.), and in the next line φασὶ δὲ πάσαις σχεδὸν ταῖς ἐνδόξοις πόλεσιν ἐπιστολὰς (obs.) διαπέμψαι αὐτόν, . . . καὶ παραινέσεις (obs.). It is not, of course, the words themselves that are noticeable, but the circumstance that these coincidences, such as they are, concern the Ignatian Epistles, which the writer of *Peregrinus* imitates in § 41, from which the words now given are taken. It must further be observed that Polycarp's mention of these epistles, to which Cod. 126 so specially calls our attention, is contained in a passage quoted by Eusebius in *H. E.* iii. 36. We can now understand the interest which our writers would seem to have felt in this chapter of Eusebius (*vid. sup.* p. 244). Chapter 37 is very short. Chapter 38 is on Clement's Epistles, and appears to be used by Photius in Cod. 113, and perhaps here in Cod. 126. It begins with ὥσπερ οὖν ἀμέλει κ.τ.λ. The writer of *Peregrinus*, shortly before in § 39, has

ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ κ.τ.λ. (*vid. sup.* p. 232). In the forged excerpts from Agatharchides (Cod. 250), c. ix. p. 446, the compiler speaks of δύο πόλεις ἐδόξους (comp. with *Peregrin.* 41, quoted above). He says a good deal upon these, and presently has ἐγγὺς τοῦ πρέποντος ἵσταται, and εἰσάγει δὲ μετὰ σαφηνείας καὶ τῆς περπούσης λόγῳ κοσμιότητος, p. 447. Comp. with Cod. 126.

(3.) On p. 48, a portion of *Peregrin.* 11 is given. From it comp. καὶ πάντα μόνος αὐτὸς ἄν. . . . καὶ προστάτην (obs.) ἐπέγραφον. τὸν μέγαν γοῦν ἐκεῖνον . . . εἰσήγαγεν (obs.) ἐς τὸν βίον (obs.) with Cod. 126. On p. 51, it has been shown that προστάτην ἐπέγραφον might well have been taken from Arist. *Pac.* 667.

In 657, Mercury inquires what kind of person Cleonymus may be in warlike matters. Trygæus replies, ψυχὴν ἄριστος, πλὴν γ' ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ἄρ', οὐπερ φησὶν εἶναι, τοῦ πατρός. Comp. Photius' πλὴν ὅτι κ.τ.λ. Nothing can be more appropriate to the ironical description of Clement's Epistles in Cod. 126 than this glance at Aristophanes. It will seem, perhaps, too far-fetched. Observe, then, that Clement in *Ep.* i. 61 has the expression of which Photius here complains. Clement says, ὁ μόνος δυνατὸς ποιῆσαι ταῦτα καὶ περισσότερα ἀγαθὰ μεθ' ἡμῶν, σοὶ ἐξομολογούμεθα διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιμερέως καὶ προστάτου τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν 'I. X. κ.τ.λ. Comp. with the words, from *Peregrin.* 11, just quoted, also with μονάτατος γὰρ εἶ σὺ πάντων αἰτίας, καὶ τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν . . . ΠΛΟΥ. ἐγὼ τοσαῦτα δυνατὸς εἰμ' εἰς ὧν ποεῖν, Arist. *Plut.* 181 sq., quoted on p. 47, in connection with *Peregrin.* 11 (obs.). Clement goes on almost immediately to say πάντα τόπον ἐψηλάφησαμεν. In *Pac.* 673 (προστ. ἐπεγρ., 667), Aristophanes has πρὸ τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἐψηλαφῶμεν ἐν σκότῳ τὰ πράγματα νυνὶ δ' ἅπαντα κ.τ.λ. Clement no doubt "examined every passage" and "handled every topic" in his own fashion. If we turn to *Theoph.* 18 (to which we have had occasion to refer again and again), we find προστάτην (Serapis), and a little above it . . . σκότος ψηλαφητόν καὶ ἰδοῦ . . . βασιλεύς, μεμονωμένος, γυμνὸς καὶ ἄοπλος. Comp. with Clement and with Aristophanes, who has in *Pac.* 661 ἀποβολιμαῖος τῶν ὅπλων, and in 669 γυμνὸς ἄν. It is the person concerning whom the πλὴν ὅτι is said who was given to casting away his arms; and however improbable it

may seem at first sight, it may be that the writer of Cod. 126 takes the expression from no other place than this.

(4.) We have just now given τὸν μέγαν γοῦν out of *Peregrin.* 11, where προστάτης is used. On p. 48 sq., it has been shown that this is taken from Arist. *Plut.* 170 μέγας δὲ βασιλεύς οὐχὶ διὰ τοῦτον κομᾷ; We have given the whole of Cod. 126. The very next words are Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου ἡ εἰς Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα τετράβιβλος. These words form the title of Cod. 127. This must be an accidental coincidence, it will be said. We must not be too sure of this.

Clement has the combination of which Photius complains, not only in § 61, where we have just found it, but also in § 36. Some portion of this section will be found on p. 22. We shall now add a few lines in order that its contents may be sufficiently before us. Clement adds, διὰ τούτου ἠθέλησεν ὁ δεσπότης τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ἡμᾶς γεύσασθαι· ὃς ἂν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ τοσοῦτα μείζων ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσα διαφορώτερον ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκεν (Heb. i. 4). γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως· Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους . . . πυρὸς φλόγα (Heb. i. 7). . . καὶ πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν· Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου (Heb. i. 13). On τὸν ἀρχιερέα κ.τ.λ., Lightfoot says: "This is founded on the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 17, iii. 1, iv. 14, 15, etc.), of which Clement's language throughout this section is an echo." In Heb. iv. 14, our Lord is called ἀρχιερέα μέγαν. We believe that the μέγας βασιλεύς of Aristophanes, which is taken up by τὸν μέγαν in *Peregrin.* 11, in connection with προστάτην, and by τὸ παιδίον μέγα in the *Evang. Thom.* (*vid. sup.* p. 61), to be taken up by μέγας βασιλεύς in the *Bibliotheca* and in *Theophilus*, and by ἀρχιερέα in Clement.

It will be seen on examination that Clement has διὰ τούτου five times over (*vid. sup.* pp. 22, 61). Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* iv. 16, p. 613, who is supposed to quote some part of our § 36, supplies only one. Aristophanes has διὰ τοῦτον exactly five times; and each one of Clement's clauses, which he ushers in with διὰ τούτου, is represented in *Plutus*. It will be remembered that in this play the god Plutus is brought upon the scene ἐν σχήματι ἀνδρός, as the scholiast says. He appears as blind, and explains that Zeus had blinded him that he might not be able to discriminate between good

persons and bad. In the part of the play now before us, two persons, by name Chremylus (δεσπότης) and Cario (θεράπων), offer to get Plutus' blindness removed, and try to overcome his dread of Zeus by explaining to him how much greater he is, and how much more power and influence he exerts in the world.

Διὰ τοῦτον occurs in the line (170) already quoted: μέγας δὲ βασιλεὺς οὐχὶ διὰ τοῦτον κομᾷ (ἐπαίρεται, θάλλει,¹ Schol.); Comp. Clement's διὰ τούτου . . . ἀναθάλλει. In 133 sq. we find XP. θύουσι δ' αὐτῷ διὰ τίν'; οὐ διὰ τουτονί; KA. καὶ νῆ Δι' εὐχονται γε πλουτεῖν ἄντικρυς. XP. οὐκ οὐν ὅδ' ἐστὶν αἷτιος; . . . ΠΑ. τί λέγεις; δι' ἐμὲ θύουσιν αὐτῷ. XP. φήμ' ἐγώ. καὶ νῆ Δι', εἴ τί γ' ἔστι λαμπρὸν καὶ καλὸν ἢ χάριεν ἀνθρώποισι, διὰ σὲ γίγνεται (τὸ δὲ λαμπρὸν ἐπὶ ὄψεως, Schol.). Comp. Clement's διὰ τούτου ἀτενίσωμεν κ.τ.λ. διὰ τούτου ἐνοπτριζόμεθα . . . ὅψιν κ.τ.λ., and observe that the words τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν immediately precede.

In 114 Chremylus says to Plutus, οἶμαι σὺν θεῷ δ' εἰρήσεται, ταύτης ἀπαλλάξιν σε τῆς ὀφθαλμίας, βλέψει πόησας (εἰ πάλιν ἀναβλέψειας. 95). Comp. Clement's διὰ τούτου ἡνεώχθησαν κ.τ.λ.

In 160 Chremylus says τέχναι δὲ πᾶσαι διὰ σὲ καὶ σοφίσματα ἐν τοῖσιν ἀνθρώποισιν ἐσθ' εὕρημένα. Comp. Clement's διὰ τούτου ἡθέλησαν ὁ δεσπότης (ταύτης δεσπότης, *Plut.* 201), ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ἡμᾶς γεύσασθαι.

In 128 Chremylus says to Plutus ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀποδείξω σε τοῦ Διὸς πόλιν μείζον δυνάμενον. Comp. ὅς ὢν κ.τ.λ., and observe that κρείττων, not μείζων, is used in Heb. i. 4. The alteration appears to be a glance at Aristophanes.

Now it must be observed that we have neither searched Aristophanes for something suitable for our purpose, nor yet Clement for a passage out of which a parallel for Aristophanes might, by the exercise of some ingenuity, be extracted. The lines of Aristophanes and the section of Clement are both alike definitely marked out for us. *Plut.* 168 is one of the passages to which editors of Lucian specially refer in illustration of a story told in *Peregrin.* 9. We have seen (p. 45) that this story is taken up in the *Evang. Thom.*, and further

¹ Comp. Diodorus, quoted on p. 152 (Nos. 3, 8), with the scholiast and Clement, *vid. sup.* p. 22.

(p. 61), that the lines of *Plutus* are used elsewhere in the gospel, as well as in *Peregrin.* 11, where the word *προστάτης* occurs. In the use of this word, made specially noticeable by Photius' animadversions in Cod. 126, a connection has been pointed out between *Peregrin.* 11 and the pseudo-Helladian excerpts, at a point where the writer of the excerpts expressly uses *Plut.* 182. We are now examining Cod. 126. The word *προστάτης* comes up again for examination. We turn to the pseudo-Helladian excerpts, to *Peregrin.* 11, to *Plutus*, and we find in each some point of contact with Cod. 126. Photius' complaint opens to us those passages of Clement where the word complained of is used. We take up, first, § 61, and find a coincidence not only with *Pax* (where *προστάτης* is used), but also with *Plutus*; then § 36, and find *Plutus* to all appearance to be so used in this section, that the lines of *Plutus* read like a parody upon Clement (*vid. sup.* p. 18). Can these things be accidental?

2. We have some rather important evidence to bring forward to prove that they are not.

(1.) The "scholia" on *Plut.* 21 (οὐ γάρ με τυπτήσεις στέφανον ἔχοντά γε) are two in number. The first has these words, *παρρησιάζεται (ὁ Καρίαν) πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην* (*Plut.* 201 *δεσπότης· κύριος*, Schol.); the second *τὸ τῆς τυχῆς ὑποδέξ.* Attention has been called to this last word, "which is very rare in the positive," on p. 23 sq. Two examples of its use are there given, each of which shows a connection with Clement. Here is another example, and here also is another connection with Clement, for in *Ep.* i. 53 he says (of Moses) *παρρησιάζεται θεράπων πρὸς κύριον*. Comp. with the scholiast. The coincidence is made more remarkable from the circumstance that C reads *δεσπότης* instead of *θεράπων*. Neither of these words is in the context to catch the scribe's eye. Both are virtually in the scholiast, for Cario was *ὁ θεράπων*, and is so called in lines three and five.

In the scholion on *Plut.* 27 is the word *κερδαλέον*. It is used in Clem. *Ep.* ii. 20 *εἰ γάρ τὸν μισθὸν τῶν δικαίων ὁ Θεὸς συντόμως ἀπεδίδου, εὐθέως ἐμπορίαν ἡσκοῦμεν καὶ οὐ θεοσέβειαν· ἐδοκοῦμεν γὰρ εἶναι δίκαιοι, οὐ τὸ εὐσεβὲς ἀλλὰ τὸ κερδαλέον διώκοντες· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεία κρίσις ἔβλαψεν πνεῦμα μὴ ὄν δίκαιον, καὶ ἐβάρυνεν δεσμοῖς*. The scholion on line 88 is too

long for transcription, but our readers will find that it supplies an excellent parallel. A few lines below it the scholiast has *βαρύνει*. In comparing it with Clement, his § 10, the close of § 19, and the whole of § 20 should be read. *Plut.* 50, 28 sq., 33 sq., 37, etc., and the scholiast's language on lines 11, 15, should also be observed and compared with Clement. The close connection of Clement's *Ep.* ii. with Aristophanes and his scholiast cannot be mistaken.

(2.) With the close of the passage just given from ii. 20, comp. *Trag.* in *Lycurg.* c. *Leocr.* p. 159 ὅταν γὰρ ὀργὴ δαιμόνων βλάβη τινά, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ πρῶτον, ἐξαφαιρεῖται φρενῶν τὸν νοῦν τὸν ἐσθλὸν κ.τ.λ. This passage is quoted by Lightfoot; we found it, however, when we were verifying the scholiast's reference to the same page in illustration of *μονώτατος* in *Plut.* 182 (*vid. sup.* p. 48). In *Theoph.* 15, we observe *πᾶσαν αἰρετικὴν φρενοβλάβειαν διεσκέδασεν, ὅτι Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.* with ἡ θεία δίκη a few lines above.

(3.) When the *Evang. Thom.* was under discussion (p. 61), a *διὰ τούτου* (comp. Clement) was pointed out in A 7, and a connection between Aristophanes and that part of the gospel was shown.

The *Evang. Thom.* has the following:—

τάχα τοῦτο πρὸ τῆς κοσμοποιίας ἐστὶν γεγεννημένον. ποία γαστήρ τοῦτο ἐβάστασεν, ποία δὲ μήτρα τοῦτο ἐξέθρεψεν, ἐγὼ ἀγνοῶ. . . οὐ παρακολουθήσω τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτοῦ. . . ἡγωνιζόμεν ἔχειν μαθητὴν, καὶ εὐρέθην ἔχειν διδάσκαλον. . . καὶ ἔχω ἐκκαλῆσαι καὶ ἀποθανεῖν διὰ τούτου τοῦ παιδὸς ('I. X.') οὐ δύναμαι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ᾠρᾷ ταύτῃ ἐμβλέψαι εἰς τὴν ὄψιν αὐτοῦ. . . οὗτος τί ποτε μέγα (οὗτος [Proteus] δὲ τί μέγα, *Peregrin.* 25), ἐστίν, ἡ θεὸς ἡ ἄγγελος, ἡ τί εἶπω οὐκ οἶδα. § 7. . . ἐγέλασε τὸ παιδίον μέγα καὶ εἶπεν . . . καὶ βλεπέτωσαν οἱ τυφλοὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ· ἐγὼ ἄνωθεν πάρεμι ἵνα . . . εἰς τὰ ἄνω καλέσω . . . καὶ ὡς τὸ παιδίον κατέπαυσε τὸν λόγον κ.τ.λ., § 8. . . ἐγὼ δὲ πλείω ὑμῶν ἐπίσταμαι· πρὸ γὰρ τῶν αἰώνων εἰμί· καὶ οἶδα πότε ἐγεννήθησαν οἱ πατέρες τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐπίσταμαι πῶσα ἔτη τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν . . . ὅτι εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι οἶδα πῶσα ἔτη τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν ἀληθῶς οἶδα πότε ἐκτίσθη ὁ κόσμος. B. 6 (the parallel passage).

Comp. (*vid. sup.* pp. 22, 252) Clement's *διὰ τούτου ἐνοπτ. τὴν . . . ὄψιν αὐτοῦ* δ. τ. ἡν. ἡ. οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας· δ. τ. ἡ. ἀσ. κ. ἐσ. διάνοια ἡ. ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς ("comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9 τοῦ ἐκ σκύτους ὑμᾶς κατέσαντος (obs.) εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς," Light.)· δ. τ. ἡθ. ὁ δεσ. τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ("S. translates *mortis scientiæ*, i.e. *θανάτου γνώσεως*," Light. Comp. with *Evang. Thom.* We shall find πῶσα ἔτη presently in *Theophilus*· ὅς ὢν . . . μερίζω

ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων κ.τ.λ., § 36. Comp. also from § 35 ταῦτα ὑπέπιπτεν πάντα ὑπὸ τὴν διάνοιαν ἡμῶν. . . ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῶν αἰώνων ὁ πανάγιος αὐτὸς γινώσκει τὴν ποσότητα καὶ τὴν καλλονὴν αὐτῶν. ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀγωνισώμεθα εὐρεθῆναι . . . ἐὰν ἐστηριγμένη ᾖ ἡ διάνοια . . . ἀκολουθήσωμεν τῇ κ.τ.λ.

It must be here again remembered that the passage from the *Evang. Thom.* is not one which has been found after diligent search, but a passage definitely marked out for us.

(4.) The presence of the word *προστάτης* in *Theoph.* 18 has been pointed out on p. 251, and in the same place coincidences between this section and Aristophanes and Clement (§ 61) in the use of the word. We must now compare *Theoph.* 18 with Clement's § 36.

We are informed in this section that the emperor Leo applied himself to the investigation of curious questions, and sought out soothsayers and astrologers. He called a certain person, Basil by name, to his help, who found a man named Sabbatius who was cunning in *μαντείαις τε καὶ οἰωνίσμασι*, and *ὑποτίθεται* (Cod. 126) *αὐτῷ* to speak all things according to the wishes of the emperor. This Sabbatius, in order (apparently) to play upon the fears of Leo, arrayed himself in chains and shut himself up *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Διαγιστεύως μεγάλου λουτροῦ τῶν καμίνων κούφοις*. Basil then brought the emperor to Sabbatius. The writer proceeds:—

Νῦξ δὲ βαθεῖα ἦν, καὶ σκότος ψηλαφητόν (Arist. Clem.) . . . ὡ πῶς οἱ θέλοντες¹ εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν (φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν, Rom. i. 22)! τί οὖν ὁ μέγας . . . βασιλεὺς (Arist. Cod. 126); προκυλινδεῖται² τοῖς ποσὶ τοῦ Πύθωνος· χρησιμδοτίας αἰτεῖται, ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρος ποτε . . . εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν Σέραπιν . . . καὶ ὁρᾷ τινὰς ἀστράπτοντας ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀνακειμένους,³ ἕνα δὲ λέγοντα αὐτῷ, Χαίροις Ἀλέξανδρε· οἷδάς με τίς εἰμι; ὁ δὲ Πῶς, κύριε; ὁ δὲ μάγος (*vid. sup.*

¹ Comp. Clement's *ἠθέλησεν ὁ δισπότης τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ἡμᾶς γέυσασθαι*, *vid. sup.* p. 252. He uses Rom. i. 21 (Lightfoot).

² Comp. *ταῦτα δὲ μοι ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος* (obs.) ὁ ἱατρὸς διηγέσατο, μετακληθείς, ὡς ἐπισκοπήσειεν (comp.) αὐτόν· ἔφη οὖν καταλαβεῖν αὐτὸν χαμαὶ κυλιόμενον (obs.), καὶ τὸν φλογμὸν οὐ φέροντα, καὶ ψυχρὸν αἰτοῦντα (obs.) κ.τ.λ., and advising Proteus to accept the death that seemed to be at his door, rather than seek for some unusual mode of dying. *Peregrin.* 44.

³ Comp. S. Matt. xxii. 11, 12. Ver. 10 is used earlier in the section. On p. 220, coincidences are shown between this section and the forged excerpts from Agatharchides, and on p. 100, the use of S. Matt. xxii. in those excerpts. Comp. also S. Luke xxiv. 4 *δύο ἄνδρες* . . . ἐν ἱερῇσιν ἀστραπτούσαις, and observe Clement's *ἀγγέλων* and *ὀφθαλμοί*, *vid. sup.* pp. 22, 252.

p. 49). 'Εγώ εἰμι Σεσοῦχ . . . οὐ τοσοῦτον¹ δ' εὐτύχησα, ὅσον σύ· καὶ σχεῖς ὄνομα ἀθάνατον . . . Εὔσελθε ἔνδον, ἵνα θεάσῃ τὸν προστάτην (*Peregrin. Clem. Cod.* 126). εἰσέρχεται Ἀλέξανδρος ἔνδον· ὁρᾷ ὁμίχλην πυραυγῇ,² καὶ καθεζόμενον³ ἐπὶ θρόνου, ὃν ποτε εἶδεν ἐν Ῥακούντιδι προσκυνούμενον βροτοῖς Σέραπιν· εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος· Κύριε, πῶσα ἔτη ζήσομαι (comp. here with *Evang. Thom.*, quoted p. 255);

The footnotes sufficiently bring out the close connection between Clement's § 36 and *Theoph.* 18, a section, observe, distinctly marked out for us by the use of *προστάτης*. The parallel with the *Evang. Thom.* forms also another connecting link with Clement, seeing that the gospel is itself in close connection with Clement. Observe again Clement's double reading: *τῆς ἀθανάτου* (and *θανάτου*) *γνώσεως* (*vid. sup.* p. 255).

Observe, further, that Clement concludes § 35 with a quotation from LXX. Ps. xlix. In the last verse but one Clement reads (in A.), *μήποτε ἀρπάσῃ ὡς λέων, καὶ μὴ ᾗ ὁ ῥύόμενος*. C. prudently omits this passage. Lightfoot remarks: "The words *ὡς λέων* are absent from the LXX., as also from the Hebrew. They must come from Ps. vii. 3, either as a gloss in Clement's text of the LXX., or as inadvertently inserted by him in a quotation made from memory." No doubt the writer of Clement's Epistle intended some such interpretation to be put upon the interpolated *ὡς λέων*. There is, however, another interpretation which is, under the circumstances, far more natural. Comp. LXX. Ps. xxi. 13 *ἤνοιξαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν, ὡς λέων ὁ ἀρπάζων καὶ ὠρυόμενος (ὁ ῥύόμενος)*. Now, mark, in *Theoph.* 18, the emperor's name is Λέων, and on the preceding page we find ἀλλ' αὖθις πάλιν ἡμῖν φερώνυμος τῆς δυσσεβείας θήρ, ὡς λέων ἀρπάζων, καὶ ὠρυόμενος ἐνέσκηψεν. Two lines above we observe τῷ μεγάλῳ ἀρχιερεῖ applied to Nicephorus. Comp. with Clement's ἀρχιερέα (applied to our Lord) in the beginning of § 36 (*vid. sup.* p. 252).

We need not comment on these coincidences, which are fatal alike to Clement's *Ep.* i. and to *Theophilus*, further than

¹ Comp. Clement's *ὅς ᾧ . . . τοσοῦτον* (obs.) *μείζων* (*vid. sup.* p. 253) *ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῃ* (obs.) *διαφορώτερον ὄνομα* (obs.), *vid. sup.* p. 252. We have just seen Clement's *ἀθανάτου*.

² Comp. Clement's *πυρὸς φλόγα*, *vid. sup.* p. 252.

³ Comp. Clement's *κάθου κ.τ.λ.*, *vid. sup.* p. 252.

to point out that it is now quite evident that the ὄψις of Clement's διὰ τούτου ἐνοπτρίζομεθα τὴν ἁμαρμον καὶ ὑπερτάτην ὄψιν αὐτοῦ (*vid. sup.* p. 255) is represented in *Theophilus* by the vision of Serapis vouchsafed to Alexander, and that the word προστάτης is deliberately assigned to Serapis in jesting justification of the equally jesting protest of Cod. 126.

There is still, however, something to be said. With Clement's words just given, comp. Plut. ii. p. 695 . . . καὶ κατακερματίζειν. ἄλλα γὰρ ἄλλους . . . πρὸς τὴν ψύξιν (ὄψιν. *v.l.*)· ἔπειτα τῇ ὄψει παρέχει καθαρῶτατον (*obs.*) ἐνοπτρίσασθαι . . . καὶ σμικρότατον ἀντακλᾶ (?) τὸ φῶς ἐπὶ τὴν ὄψιν. Comp. with Clement above, and on p. 22. With Plutarch, comp. ἀλλὰ ἄλλος ἀνέτελλεν (*vid. infr.* p. 262) ἥλιος κατακερματίζων. Achill. Tat. v. 2. A few lines above, in § 1, we find πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν. But Tatius is here giving an account of Alexandria, and specially, in § 2, of the city as illuminated in honour of Serapis. With *Theoph.* 18, as quoted above, comp. Tatius' ἀστράπτων with ὀφθαλμούς in the next line; ὃν . . . Σέραπιν δὲ καλοῦσιν Αἰγύπτιοι . . . καὶ τοῦτο μέγιστον ἐθεασάμεν· ἐσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν . . . καὶ νύξ ἦν οὐδαμοῦ· . . . τότε γὰρ εἶδον πόλιν ἐρίζουσιν¹ περὶ κάλλους οὐρανῶ . . . οἰωνός. Both Tatius and the writer of *Theophilus* have ἀμυχανίαν. Tatius has here also ὁ γὰρ Χαιρέας πρὸ πολλοῦ τῆς Λευκίππης ἐλάνθανεν ἐρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μεμήνυκε τὸ φάρμακον, with δριμύ after a few lines. In *Peregrin.* 45, almost immediately after the words quoted in a note on p. 256 in illustration of *Theophilus*, we find ἐγὼ δὲ οὐδ' αὐτὸς πρὸ πολλῶν (*obs.*) ἡμερῶν εἶδον αὐτὸν ἐγκεχρισμένον, ὡς ἀποδακρύσειε τῷ δριμυεῖ (*obs.*) φαρμάκῳ.²

Other coincidences might be pointed out, but these suffice to show how closely Cod. 126, Clement's *Epistles*, *Peregrinus*, the *Evang. Thom.*, and Tatius' love-story are connected together. If five authors produced these five sets of writings,

¹ Comp. τὸ κάλλος ἀμύχανον, ὃν καὶ εἰσάντα περὶ κάλλους κ.τ.λ. Phot. *Bibl.* 190. A coincidence between this sentence and Cedrenus is pointed out on p. 200. It is amusing to observe that the writer is speaking of the various celebrated personages of the name of Achilles.

² The writer proceeds: οὐ πάνυ τοὺς ἀμβλυποῦντας ὁ Δίακλῆς παραδέχεται. ὅμοιον ὡς εἴ τις ἐπὶ σταυρὸν ἀναβήσεται μέλλων, τὸ ἐν τῷ δακτύλῳ πρόσπαισμα βεραπέου. Comp. Plut. ii. p. 73 ἀμβλὺς ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις νοθεύων ἔσται καὶ ἄπρακτος, ὥσπερ ἰατρός δριμὺ φάρμακον, and after half a dozen lines καὶ γὰρ ἰατρός φιλότμος, ἱμπύου περὶ ἥπαρ ἀνθρώπου δείξαντος αὐτῷ τὸν δάκτυλον ἡλωμένον κ.τ.λ.

they must needs have been well acquainted with each other's secrets.

3. We shall now invite our readers to the consideration of Bas. *De Spir. Sanct.* c. xxix. This chapter is remarkable as containing the only reference to Clement's Epistles which is to be found in Basil's writings. If we are right in supposing these epistles to be frauds, we shall, almost of a certainty, find some evidence to show that their author consulted Basil, as he must have done, seeing that the words which Basil quotes are found in *Ep.* i. 58. If, again, we are right in supposing Photius' *Bibliotheca* to have been interpolated, and that Cod. 126 in particular has been fraudulently inserted, it will possibly be the case that some recollections, of a chapter so interesting to the writer as Basil's c. xxix. must have been, will be found. The question is, however, complicated by another circumstance. Some of the later chapters, and among them c. xxix., have been pronounced spurious by Erasmus. It is true that Isaac Casaubon answered Erasmus very "satisfactorily," as many think. Still the fact remains that Erasmus, no mean judge, pronounced against c. xxix., among others, on grounds which he deemed sufficient. If the close of *De Spir. Sanct.* is a spurious addition, we shall naturally suspect that it was added to support Clement's *Ep.* i. (if a forgery), and expect to find in it some plain indications of authorship. If, on the other hand, these closing chapters are really from the pen of Basil, and Cod. 126 from the pen of Photius, and Clement's *Ep.* i. from the pen of the Roman bishop, it is certainly most unlikely that we shall find a sufficiency of accidental circumstances on which to argue with any show of reason (1) that the author of Clement's Epistles made use of Basil; (2) that c. xxix. was used, if it was not written, by the author of Cod. 126; and (3) that the close of Basil's treatise is connected with, and belongs to, the group of writings which we have been examining. This, nevertheless, is what we propose to do. We have three lines of argument to take, and three sets of coincidences to produce. We have been already taught (*vid. sup.* p. 77) that the cumulative force of coincidences must not be set aside, even though each in itself is insufficient to prove the case to which it relates.

1. We must observe at the outset that this chapter contains

two examples of the use of the word *προστάτης*, of which, as applied to our Lord, Cod. 126 complains. We shall give the passages presently in which the word is found; meanwhile we note the fact. The complete expression, as mentioned in Cod. 126, is found in Clement's *Ep.* i. 61 διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προστάτου (*obs.*) τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν 'I. X., δι' οὗ σοι ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη κ.τ.λ. Lightfoot says that "this is a favourite (*obs.*) form of doxology in Clement," and refers us to § 20 διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν 'I. X., ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. It happens that Basil has here a good deal to say upon doxologies, and cites, not Clement, but Africanus as writing . . . Πατρὶ καὶ Κ. ἡ. 'I. X. ᾧ ἡ δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη σὺν ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. We must either believe this interesting coincidence to be purely accidental, or else concede that the writer of Clement's Epistle borrowed from Basil, unless, indeed, he was the author of a spurious addition to Basil's treatise.

On p. 62, Basil writes:—

τῷ δὲ καινοτομίαν ἐγκαλουμένῳ ἀναγκαῖον εἰς μαρτυρίαν διὰ τοῦ χρόνου τὴν ἀρχαιότητα, τοῦτο δὴ καὶ προθήσω· ἔδοξε τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν, and presently on the same page ἐκεῖνος (Gregory) καὶ ποταμῶν ῥεῖθρα μετέστησεν (1 Cor. xiii. 2), ἐπιτάξας αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ μεγάλῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ λίμνην ἐξήρανε ὑπόθεσιν πολέμου φέρουσαν ἀδελφοῖς πλεονέκταις· αἱ δὲ τῶν μελλόντων προαγορεύσεις τοιαῦται, ὥς μηδὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἀποδεῖν προφητῶν. καὶ ὅλως μακρὸν ἂν εἴη τοῦ ἀνδρὸς διηγέσθαι τὰ θαύματα, ὅς τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ χαρισμάτων (1 Cor. xii. 31), τῶν ἐνεργουμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι (Heb. ii. 4) δεύτερος¹ Μωϋσῆς . . . ἀνηγορεύετο.

Basil's ποταμῶν ῥεῖθρα suggested to us the examination of Philo (*De Mund.*) i. p. 31:—

τῶν δὲ εἰρημένων οὐκ ἀποδεῖ (*obs.*) καὶ τὸ μέλλον (*obs.*) λέγεσθαι. πάσῃ μητρὶ καθάπερ ἀναγκαιότατον (*obs.*) μέρος ἡ φύσις πηγάζοντας ἀνέδωκε μαστούς . . . παρ' ὃ καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις (*obs.*) ἔδοξεν (*obs.*) αὐτὴν (γῆν) Δήμητραν καλεῖσαι (*obs.*), τὸ μητρὸς καὶ γῆς ὄνομα (*obs.*) συνθεῖσθαι (*obs.*) . . . εἰκότως οὖν καὶ γῆ . . . ἀνέδωκεν ἡ φύσις, οἷα μαστούς, ποταμῶν (*obs.*) ῥεῖθρα (*obs.*) καὶ πηγῶν, ἵνα . . . καὶ ποτὸν ἄφθονον ἔχοι πάντα τὰ ζῶα, with ζωῆς after two lines. Higher up on p. 31, Philo has ἐξ ὧν ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργήθη. ὁ Μωϋσῆς δὲ . . . στοιχεῖον μὲν οἶται εἶναι τὴν μεγάλην θάλατταν, μοῖραν τετάρτην τῶν συμπάντων, ἣν οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν

¹ Is this serious writing, or was Achilles as well as Moses in the writer's mind (*vid. sup.* p. 188)?

ὡκεανὸν προσαγορεύοντες, τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν πλωτὰ πελάγη λιμένους ἔχειν λόγον νόμιζουσι· τὸ δὲ γλυκὺ καὶ πότιμον ὕδωρ . . . συνέχεται.

Clement, *Ep.* i. 20 (obs.), writes:—

ἡλιός τε καὶ . . . ἐξελίσσουσιν τοὺς ἐπιταγμένους (Basil) αὐτοῖς (Basil) ὀρισμούς. γῆ κυοφοροῦσα (obs.) . . . ζώοις (obs.) ἀνατέλλει τροφήν (obs.) . . . τοῖς αὐτοῖς συνέχεται (obs.) προστάγμασιν . . . ἀλλὰ καθὼς διέταξεν αὐτῇ . . . ὡκεανὸς (obs.) ἀνθρώποις ἀπέραντος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν¹ (obs.) κόσμοι (obs.) ταῖς αὐταῖς ταγαῖς τοῦ δεσπότης διευθύνονται . . . ἄεναοί τε πηγαὶ (obs.) πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν καὶ ὑγείαν δημιουργηθεῖσαι (obs.) δίχα ἐλλείψως παρέχονται τοὺς πρὸς ζωῆς (obs.) ἀνθρώποις μαζούς (obs.). τὰ τε ἐλάχιστα τῶν ζώων τὰς συνελύσεις αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιοῖα καὶ εἰρήνῃ ποιοῦνται· ταῦτα πάντα ὁ μέγας δημιουργὸς . . . προσέταξεν εἶναι κ.τ.λ.

On an earlier page (p. 8), Philo first brings forward the idea for which Clement seems to be indebted to him:—

ὅπως οἷα μήτηρ . . . βρῶσιν τε καὶ πόσιν παρέχη (obs.)· διὸ φλέβας μαστοῖς κ.τ.λ. Directly afterwards Philo has ταῦτα διαταξάμενος (obs.), ὀνόματα (obs.) αὐτοῖς ἐτίθει, τὴν μὲν ξηράν (obs.), and, after a few lines, on p. 9 εἰς . . . ἀπόλαυσιν (obs.) ζώων τῶν αὐτίκα γεννησομένων. ὁ μὲν δὴ προστάττει (obs.) τῇ γῇ ταῦτα γεννῆσαι (obs.)· ἡ δὲ ὥσπερ ἐκ πολλοῦ κυοφοροῦσα (obs.) . . . τροφαὶ (obs.) ζώοις (obs.).

Comp. with Clement and Basil.

We can hardly think it possible that any one will contend that these coincidences, found as they have been, have accidentally arisen, or that Clement and Basil (or either of them) can reasonably be thought to have used Philo in the fashion indicated by these coincidences. The idea that these bishops, while composing, the one a letter to the Corinthians, the other a treatise on the Holy Spirit, lingered over the pages of Philo considering how best they might make Philo's ideas, and still more Philo's Greek, serve their own purpose, is too ludicrous to

¹ "This passage is directly quoted by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 12 (p. 693), by Origen *de Princ.* ii. 6 (I. pp. 82, 83), *Select. in Ezech.* viii. 3 (III. p. 422), by Jerome *ad Ephes.* ii. 2 (VII. p. 571)." Lightfoot. It is also quoted, and in some respects more completely, by Didymus, *Expos. in Ps.* cxxxviii. (LXX.) 9 (p. 1596, Migne). He does not, however, mention Clement's name. It becomes an interesting question whether Philo's words suggested the sentence, as obviously they might have done, or simply its position in § 20. It is worth observing that Clem. Alex. ushers in the subject with ὑποτίθεται. Accordingly, Cod. 126 has this word exactly in the parallel passage. Clem. Alex. also has a curious ἀνανύμωσις, which Sylburg would change to συνανύμωσις. It was doubtless the scribe's mistake or—joke. At any rate, the name of Clement of Rome is not mentioned.

be entertained for one moment. We shall produce presently a writer who did this kind of thing, but he lived in times when men went back to ancient books for their Greek, and desired nothing so much as to be able to write in the style of an old author. It is obviously natural to conclude from the coincidences before us, that the writer of Clement's Epistles was also the writer of *De Spir. Sanct.* xxix. It is, however, possible that Basil's expression *ποταμῶν ῥεῖθρα* may have been a suggestion to others besides ourselves to consult Philo.

Before we pass on to our second point, we must call special attention to an expression of which Clement makes use. On the words *παῖσιν ζώοις ἀνατέλλει τροφήν*, Lightfoot says, "comp. Epiphanes in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 2, p. 512 ἥλιος κοινὰς τροφὰς ζώοις ἅπασιν ἀνατέλλει (MSS. ἀνατέλλειν), which closely resembles our Clement's language here" (*vid. sup.* p. 258). If Clem. Alex. had written these words, it would no doubt be concluded that he had taken them from Clement of Rome. It is necessary, therefore, to consider whether there is anything to show that we have not stumbled upon a "striking" but still purely accidental coincidence. The quotation from Epiphanes in Clem. Alex. runs on to the middle of p. 513. At the top of p. 514, Epiphanes is again quoted. At the conclusion of this second quotation Clem. Alex. says *καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οἱ γενναῖοι Καρποκρατιανοὶ δογματίζουσι*. Our Clement has *τῶν δεδογματισμένων* in the same sentence with the words under consideration. Clem. Alex. after one line proceeds, *οὐ γὰρ ἀγάπην εἵπομι' ἂν ἔγωγε τὴν συνέλευσιν αὐτῶν*. Comp. Clement's *συνελεύσεις αὐτῶν* in § 20 (obs.), quoted above. After a few lines we observe in a quotation from Xanthus an example of the use of *θεμιτόν* without a negative. Our Clement's *Ep.* i. 63 begins with *θεμιτόν οὖν*, and Lightfoot remarks that "the use of this word seems to be extremely rare, except with a negative." *Συνέλευσις* is not a common word. As it stands in Clem. Alex. it suggests a double meaning; and as it stands in our Clement it is capable, as Lightfoot points out, of such double meaning. *Συνουσία* is another and classical word of the same kind. It may be remembered that a joke by pseudo-Agatharchides in the use of this last word has been pointed out on p. 236. If, for this reason, we turn to the excerpts, we find, a few lines below the use of the word, *οὐδὲ τὴν ἐλαχίστην*

διδόασιν ἔννοιαν. Comp. Clement's ἐλάχιστα, and observe that μεταπαραδιδόασιν (A.) or μεταδιδόασιν (C.) is here in § 20. The words of the excerpt are not in Diodorus, and they may be remembered as supplying a possible indication of a joint authorship of the excerpts and Clement's Epistle.

We turn now to the parallel passage in Diodorus (iii. 17, p. 186). We find ourselves in pages over which not pseudo-Agatharchides only, but also pseudo-Galen, Tatius, and the writer of the *Oratio* made themselves very merry. The close connection between pseudo-Agatharchides and Clement has been pointed out on p. 220. We naturally, therefore, consider how our pseudo-Clement, with his proneness to parody, of which we have already had so many examples, would be likely to contemplate these pages. Diodorus' narrative, we may remark, cannot possibly be read without a smile at least (*vid. sup.* p. 236). We observe at once πρὸς τὴν . . . ἀπόλαυσιν (obs.) in a sentence which speaks of babes in their mothers' arms, and children weaned from their mothers' milk, of γλυκέων (obs. p. 261) ὑδάτων to which the people young and old hurry on τῇ πέμπτῃ (ἡμέρᾳ), and which could not fail to recall to the recollection of a student of Philo, in search of a parody, the passage which we have shown to have been used in Clement § 20. On the preceding page we observe ἅς συμμέτρως ξηρανθείσας (comp. Basil) καθίσαντες κατευωχοῦνται, οὐ μὴν πρὸς μέτρον ἢ σταθμὸν ἐσθίοντες, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκάστου βούλησιν . . . ἀπολαυσέως (obs.) περιγραφὴν ἀνεκλείπτως (obs.) . . . εἰς τὴν χέρσον κυλινδεῖται κύμα . . . τὰ μὲν γὰρ κύτῃ συντρίβουσι . . . διὰ τὴν συνέχειαν τῶν πνευμάτων. Comp. with those portions of Clement's § 20, which have been quoted on p. 261. In the same section Clement has κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἰδίοις . . . τὸ κύτος . . . ἕως ᾧδε ἤξεις, καὶ τὰ κύματά σου ἐν σοὶ συντριβήσεται . . . ἀνέμων σταθμοὶ κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον καιρὸν τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν ἀπροσκόπως (*vid. sup.* p. 24) ἐπιτελοῦσιν. On ἀνέμων σταθμοί, Lightfoot says, "From Job xxviii. 25 ἐποίησεν δὲ ἀνέμων σταθμὸν καὶ ὑδάτων μέτρα, where it means 'weight,' as the original shows." Comp. with Diodorus. See also p. 114, where the alteration in meaning is mentioned along with one or two other changes of a similar character. With Clement, comp. also οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα κ.τ.λ., Heb. i. 14. Observe Diodorus'

πνεύματων (ventorum). Heb. i. 12 may also be used in § 20. In chap. ii. 2 we remark πᾶσα παράβασις. Clement has δίχα πάσης παραβάσεως (C. παρεκβάσεως, A.). Verse 4 runs συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι, καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν. Comp. the last clause with Clement, and the remainder of the verse with Basil, quoted on p. 260. This last coincidence draws the connection between Basil and Clement much closer. Other things will be pointed out directly in Diodorus, but these amply suffice to show the use to which his pages were put by Clement, as well as by the other writers mentioned above, for it would be unreasonable to contend that the coincidences which have been pointed out between Diodorus' account of the Ichthyophagi, and Clement's Hexæmeron, as we may call it, have accidentally arisen. We must remember that it was pseudo-Agatharchides' jesting use of the συνουσία (συνέλευσις in Clement) which guided us to Diodorus.

If any one is curious to know the way in which Clement has built up the sentence containing συνέλευσις, and contrived to combine, as it were, its two meanings, he may look back to p. 130, where it is shown that the word is found in Basil's *Hom. in Ps.* cxxxii. (LXX.). We shall not repeat what is there said, but we may return for one moment to the *Homily*. We observe ἡ μὲν ὑπόθεσις τῶν ἀδελφῶν (comp. with Basil, quoted on p. 260) συγκροτήσεως ἐκ θείου προστάγματος ἀνυπερβλήτον εἶχε τὸ καλόν, with τῆς ἐκ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπης after one line. Comp. ᾧ μεγάλῃς ἀγάπῃς, ᾧ τελειότητος ἀνυπερβλήτου. Clem. *Ep.* i. 53. This adds another to the coincidences pointed out on p. 130. The coincidence with the passage from *De Spir. Sanct.* xxix. confirms the view which we have been taking of the connection of Clement with that chapter (*vid. infr.* p. 271, n.).

We can now hardly doubt that our Clement made use of the quotation from Epiphanes, found in Clem. Alex. There is still, however, something to be said. Lightfoot supposes Clement to mean by his οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν κόσμοι, "some unknown land in the far west beyond the ocean," and says that "this interpretation is quite consistent with the fact that Clement below (§ 33) speaks of the ocean as τὸ περιέχον τὴν γῆν ὕδαρ."

So in the quotation from Epiphanes, a few lines above the words cited, we find . . . οὐρανός, κύκλω τὴν γῆν περιέχει πᾶσαν. In § 33,¹ Clement writes:—

αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ ἀγαλλιᾶται· τῇ γὰρ παμμεγεθεστάτῳ αὐτοῦ κράτει οὐρανοὺς ἐστήρισεν, καὶ τῇ ἀκαταλήπτῳ αὐτοῦ συνέσει διεκόσμησεν αὐτοὺς· γῆν τε διεχώρισεν (ἐχώρισεν, Damasc.) ἀπὸ τοῦ περιέχοντος αὐτὴν ὕδατος καὶ ἤδρασεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀσφαλῆ τοῦ ἰδίου βουλῆματος θεμέλιον [τά τε ἐν αὐτῇ ζῶα φοιτῶντα τῇ ἑαυτοῦ διατάξει ἐκέλευσεν εἶναι· θάλασσαν τε καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ζῶα προδημιουργήσας ἐνέκλεισε (C. ἐνέκλισεν, A.) τῇ ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμει]. ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ ἐξοχώτατον καὶ παμμέγεθες [κατὰ δianoian], ἄνθρωπον, ταῖς ἱεραῖς καὶ ἀμώμοις χερσὶν ἔπλασε, τῆς ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνος χαρακτῆρα.

This section forms a supplement to § 20, and was plainly written at the same time; for, if we take up Diodorus exactly where we left off, we find in the same sentence with διὰ τὴν συνέχειαν τῶν πνευμάτων (*vid. sup.* p. 263) the words καὶ τὴν εἰωθυῖαν θήραν τῶν ἰχθύων ἐκκλείσῃ. Compare. Above, in Diodorus, we observe ἐγκεκλιμένων, which would, with ἐκκλείσῃ, naturally suggest both the true and the corrupt (?) reading. Diodorus proceeds εἰ δὲ ἡ ἐκ τῶν κόγχων τροφὴ σπανίζει, καταφύγουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν τῶν ἀκανθῶν σωρόν (*vid. sup.* p. 237). We take up the words of Clement in § 20 also where we left off (*vid. sup.* p. 261) . . . προσέταξεν εἶναι (cf. § 33), εὐεργετῶν τὰ πάντα, ὑπερεκπερισσῶς δὲ ἡμᾶς τοὺς προσπεφευγότας τοῖς οἰκτιρμοῖς αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Comp. with Diodorus. Now mark the connection of ideas. Comp. καὶ ὑπερπερισσῶς (ὑπερεκπερισσῶς, *v.l.* D.U.I. Alf.) ἐξεπλήσσοντο, λέγοντες, Καλῶς πάντα πεποιήκε (= Clement's εὐεργετῶν τὰ πάντα) κ.τ.λ. S. Mark vii. 37. *The miracle of the feeding of the four thousand immediately follows.* Comp. Diodorus' τροφὴ σπανίζει. The σπλαγχνίζομαι of S. Mark viii. 2 plainly suggests the οἰκτιρμοῖς of Clement. There will be no further doubt as to the use of Diodorus.

¹ This passage is found in J. Damasc. *Sacr. Par.* lit. A, tit. viii. p. 310, also in some extracts under the name of Leontius and John (still in ms. *Cod. Græc. Vat.* 1553, f. 22; Lightfoot, *Addend.* p. 426). The words in brackets are, however, peculiar to our Clement, and special notice should be taken of this circumstance in considering the coincidences which will be given out of Philo and Diodorus. It will be a question whether the page of Philo suggested the composition of the passage, or merely its position in our Epistle. Leontius and John and the Damascene are not independent of one another, as the omissions and a peculiar reading παμμιγεστάτῳ belonging to them both sufficiently show.

We turn now to Philo, and go on with the first passage (*vid. sup.* p. 260) exactly where we left off . . . πάντα τὰ ζῶα. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτά φησιν, ὅτι Ἐπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς ἄνθρωπον, χοῦν λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς. ἐναργέστατα καὶ διὰ τούτου παρίστησιν, ὅτι διαφορὰ παμμεγέθους, ἐστὶ τοῦ τε νῦν πλασθέντος ἀνθρώπου, καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα Θεοῦ γεγονότος πρότερον, with θνητὸν μὲν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα, κατὰ δὲ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀθάνατον a few lines below. Comp. with Clement's § 33.

We now go on with the passage from Philo (p. 8), and once more exactly where we left off: εἶτα διακοσμεῖν ἄρχεται τὴν γῆν (*vid. sup.* p. 261). On p. 10, Philo has ὁ δὲ οὐρανὸς διεκοσμεῖτο. Comp. with § 33.

We do not observe τὰ ζῶα φοιτοῦντα in Philo. We find the expression, however, a few pages further on in Diodorus: διὰ τὴν δίψαν ζῶων φοιτῶντων ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον. c. xxxvi. p. 202. Νωθοῦ follows after a few lines in Diodorus, and νωθρός is found in the second line of Clement's § 34. If our readers will consult Diodorus, they will understand why Clement speaks, as he does, of the good workman and his reward.

We must return for a moment to Philo. On p. 19 he has δῆλον γὰρ ὡς εὐμαρέστερον τοῦ τὰ μὴ ὄντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγαγεῖν κ.τ.λ. Comp. with *Theoph.* iii., quoted on p. 122, also with ὁ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγαγὼν σύμπαντα, ὁ κτίσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν, καὶ παντὶ σου χαρίσματι κατακοσμήσας, καὶ διδούς αἰτοῦντι σοφίαν καὶ σύνεσιν. *Chrys. Lit. tom.* iv. p. 525. Wust. (*Prayer of the Trisagion.*) Comp. with Clement's § 33. After three lines we find καὶ προσπεσεῖν τοῖς οἰκτιρμοῖς σου.¹ Comp. with Clement's § 20. Comp. also Clement's § 9 ἰκέται γενομένοι τοῦ ἐλέους καὶ τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ προσπέσωμεν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωμεν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμοὺς αὐτοῦ. In the liturgy ἐν τῇ χρηστότητί σου follows after two lines. Clement has directly ἀπενίσσωμεν εἰς τοὺς τελείως λειτουργήσαντας τῇ . . . δόξῃ αὐτοῦ. A few lines above, in the liturgy, we observe εἰς λειτουργίαν τῆς σῆς δόξης.

¹ The *Liturgia Constantinopolitana (ad normam hodie acceptam)* is given in *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Hammond. Oxford 1878. The omission of the words to which this note is appended forms the only noticeable verbal difference between the two versions of the *Prayer of the Trisagion*. Two or three lines at the end are indeed also omitted, but they are found immediately above the prayer in the liturgy printed amongst S. Chrysostom's works.

In the liturgy, in the next line but one to ἐν τῇ χρηστότητι σου, we find . . . δέσποτα . . . ἐν ὁσιότητι, and, a few lines above, προσπέσωμεν Χριστῷ. In § 48, Clement has προσπέσωμεν τῷ δεσπότῃ, followed after a few lines by ἐν ὁσιότητι.

The close connection between our Clement and the liturgies, and specially S. Mark's and the Clementine, is acknowledged. We doubt not that the writer of *Ep. i.* intended that it should be supposed to be in some sort the parent of the liturgies of the church. It is a trap into which every one must fall, as we did ourselves, who holds Clement's *Ep. i.* to be genuine. From the coincidences with S. Mark's liturgy, it cannot be determined whether Clement copied or was copied. The foregoing coincidences, however, seem to show that he was the copyist. The question is capable of a more decisive answer.

In the *Epistola ad Theophilum* we find a liturgical section. The writer, addressing the emperor (obs.), has ἄφες τοὺς νενεκρωμένους ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ βασιλεῖς θάψαι . . . ἀσεβῶν γὰρ καταπιπτόντων, δίκαιοι ἔκφοβοι γίνονται. τί οὖν καὶ σὺ ἀγαθὲ δέσποτα . . . ἐπίβλεψον ἐπὶ τὴν προσευχὴν τῶν ταπεινῶν, καὶ μὴ ἐξουθενώσης τὴν δέησιν αὐτῶν . . . τοὺς ἐν θλίψει παρακάλεσον . . . τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἀνακάλεσαι, τοὺς ἐσκορπισμένους¹ ἐπισυνάγαγε καὶ συναψον τὴν ἀγ. καθολ. καὶ ἀποστ. ἐκκλ. . . εἰς βαθεῖαν εἰρήνην . . . ἐξέγειρον καὶ οἰκτείρησον τὸν λαόν σου, τὸν διεσκορπισμένον καὶ διεσπαρμένον, ὡς ἀπολωλότα πρόβατα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. § 29. Comp. ἄξιουμέν σε, δέσποτα . . . τοὺς ἐν θλίψει (obs.) ἡμῶν σῶσον· τοὺς ταπεινοὺς (obs.) ἐλέησον· τοὺς πεπτωκότας (obs.) ἔγειρον· τοῖς δεομένοις (obs.) ἐπιφάνηθι· τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς (obs.) ἴασαι· . . . λύτρωσαι τοὺς δεσμίους (obs.) ἡμῶν· . . . παρακάλεσον (obs.) τοὺς ὀλιγοψυχοῦντας . . . ἡμεῖς λαός σου καὶ πρόβατα (obs.) τῆς νομῆς σου, and presently ἄφες ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ. Clem. *Ep. i.* 59. Clement uses *S. Marc. Lit. Ren.* p. 138. Now, observe, in S. Mark's liturgy, immediately above the passage used, we find τὰς ἐπισυναγωγὰς ἡμῶν . . . ἐξεγέρθητι, Κύριε, καὶ διασκορπισθήτωσαν οἱ ἐχθροί σου . . . τὸν δὲ λαόν σου κ.τ.λ. Compare with *Theophilus*. Observe also, and this especially, that on Clement's δέσποτα Lightfoot notes "*Domine bone S.*" Comp. with *Theophilus*. We shall now understand Clement's ἀσεβεῖς, which has caused the editors some perplexity,

¹ Cf. βαθ. . . εἰρ. . . τοὺς ἐσκορπ. ἐπισυναγ. . . καὶ συναψ. τῇ ἀγ. σου καθολ. καὶ ἀποστ. ἐκκλ. . . αἰχμαλώτους . . . θλίψι. *Anaph. S. Bas.* Hammond. p. 120.

and which is not in S. Mark's liturgy. The words τοὺς ἐν ὀλίψῃ are not in the liturgy.

Hitherto we have made no use of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, though they are full of coincidences with Clement. Annexed to the *Constitutions* are the *Apostolical Canons*. These would seem to have been interpolated in the interest of Clement's Epistles (*vid.* Light. p. 274 sq.). Whether the interpolator busied himself with the *Constitutions* as well as with the *Canons*, is one of the questions which has to be considered, and on which we shall endeavour to throw some light.

On Clement's *Ep.* i. 20, Lightfoot (*Addend.* p. 419) quotes from *Apost. Const.* viii. 12 (Clementine liturgy), and says that "the resemblances" which he points out "cannot be accidental." This chapter is given by Hammond (p. 95) as the Eucharistic *Preface*, and he says in a note, "With much of what follows, cf. 1 Clem. c. xx." Now it happens that in this chapter, which is thus confessedly connected with Clement's § 20, the writer uses the words which we have produced first out of Philo, then out of *Theophilus*, and S. Chrysostom's *Prayer of the Trisagion*. If we run our eye down the chapter, we are struck not merely by the resemblances with Clement's § 20, of which Lightfoot speaks, but also by what seem to be recollections of the various points specially noticed in the pages of Diodorus, which lie open before us for the examination of Clement's § 20, and which have been previously examined in connection with pseudo-Agatharchides, etc.

We will take fifty lines only for consideration. They include the resemblances to which Lightfoot has called attention.

With Philo, etc., the writer has ὁ τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγαγών. We turn to Philo (p. 19), and find after a few lines, on p. 20, πρὸς ἀπόδοσιν, and almost directly διὸ καὶ θεασάμενα πάντα διὰ πάντων ἡμεράθη,¹ with ἀτιθάσους after one line. In *Apost. Const.* we find ἡμέροις καὶ ἀτιθάσους, and a little above ὁ ποιήσας ὕδωρ πρὸς πόσιν καὶ κάθαρσιν, ἀέρα ζωτικὸν πρὸς (obs.) εἰσπνοήν ("Vind. add. καὶ ἀναπνοήν, quod

¹ Philo proceeds: καὶ ὅσα τὴν φύσιν ἀγριώτατα, κατὰ τὴν πρώτην εὐθὺς πρόσσωψιν ἐγίνετο χειρονθέστατα, τὰς μὲν ἀτιθάσους λύττας κ.τ.λ. The words may be remembered, for we shall find some presently (p. 273) very like them in Diodorus.

arridet Clerico," Ültzen) καὶ φωνῆς ἀπόδοσιν (obs.) . . . πρὸς ἐνδεΐας ἀναπλήρωσιν. These words bring up the discussions on p. 236 of the use of Diodorus' pages now before us by pseudo-Agatharchides, the συνουσία and ἀναπνοή τε καὶ φωνή (obs. combination) of pseudo-Galen, and the φωνὴν ἀποδιδόν (obs. combination) of the *Oratio*. If we turn to Diodorus (p. 186), we find τὴν ἀναπλήρωσιν τῆς ἐνδεΐας. Compare. From the preceding line πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν was taken into Clement's § 20, into one of the sentences for which Lightfoot produces (out of the fifty lines before us) a coincidence which, standing as it does with others, he thinks cannot be accidental.

In these lines we also observe σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὡς καμάραν στήσας κ.τ.λ., Isa. xl. 10. For the discussion on καμάρα, *vid. sup.* pp. 68 sq., 106 sq. The word is here in Diodorus on p. 188, and in the next line αὐτοδίδακτον τέχνην. Here, in the *Constitutions*, we remark ἡ ἀδίδακτος σοφία, ὁ πρῶτος τῇ φύσει καὶ μόνος, with διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς after one line. In the parallel passage in the excerpt we remark ὥστε ὁμογενοῦς ὄγκου καὶ μίαν φύσιν ἔχοντος. This looks very like a joke, for Diodorus contents himself with τὴν φύσιν ἔχει. The excerpt has κορυφάς, and after three lines ἄμμου, and in the next line ὄρει and σεσῶρευται. Diodorus has these words. So also in our fifty lines we observe σεσῶρευμένα, and in the next line ἄμμου, and in the next κορυφῶν εἰς ὄρεων. The excerpt (not Diodorus) has φωτίζειν, and so also the *Apost. Const.* It will be remembered that the excerpt, though it borrows καμάρα from this place of Diodorus, does not use it here but in c. xxx. Turning to the passage, we find ourselves in the near neighbourhood of περισφίγγαντες, which forms part of a coincidence both with *Theophilus* and *Tatius* (*vid. sup.* p. 220). A little above it are περιθέντες, πραῦνουσι (not in Diodorus). In our fifty lines is περισφίγγας, with περιθείς and πραῦνων a little above. Lastly, we observe in our fifty lines ὁ τὴν μεγάλην θάλασσαν χωρίσας τῆς κ.τ.λ. Comp. with Clement's § 33, quoted on p. 265.

It is impossible that these singular coincidences can have accidentally arisen. One explanation of them alone seems possible. Clement's Epistle, the excerpts from Agatharchides, and that portion of the Clementine liturgy which we have been examining, must have been written virtually by the same hand.

If any one is curious to know more about our fifty lines and their neighbourhood, he may learn a great deal by very carefully reading Euseb. *De Laud. Const.* vi. The coincidences there, both with the *Apost. Const.* here and Clement's § 20, are too numerous and too noticeable to have accidentally arisen. For example, we find there *κρείτταν παντός ἀριθμοῦ*, with *ἀφειρησίας* not far off, just as we find them here in the *Apost. Const.* We also find there the word *μεταπαράδιδωμι*. Clement uses it in § 20, and Lightfoot says "again a rare word, of which a few instances are collected in Hase and Dindorf's *Steph. Thes.*" We do not know whether the instance we have supplied is among them. We shall have occasion presently to refer to Eusebius' treatise.

We must now return to Basil's *De Spir. Sanct.* We started with the intention of showing that the writer of Clement's Epistle borrowed from Basil's c. xxix. We think that we have proved this to be the case, if we believe c. xxix. to be genuine (*vid. sup.* p. 261 sq.). We have seen reason, however, for supposing Erasmus' suspicions to have been well founded.

2. We now go on to show that the author of Cod. 126 used (if he was not the author of it) Basil's c. xxix.

From what has been already pointed out, it is quite plain that these two writings are closely connected. Cod. 126 singles out three matters in Clement's *Ep.* i. for censure. The second of these relates to the phoenix, which is not mentioned by Basil. The first matter for blame is found in § 20, the third in § 61 (as well as elsewhere). These two sections are united by the doxology which they have in common with Africanus, as quoted by Basil. We have further found our way, on the suggestion of an expression of which Basil makes use, to the very words in § 20 of which Cod. 126 complains. Basil supplies us, moreover, with two examples of the use of *προστάτης* so much disliked (?) by the author of Cod. 126. We find these things here in Basil, and yet turn to c. xxix. only because it professes to contain a quotation from Clement, and because Erasmus ventured to pronounce this with some other chapters to be spurious. Cod. 126 is short, and some coincidences with other writings have been pointed out; we cannot therefore expect to find in Basil many resemblances in language. He has, however, a sentence which might well have been written by

the author of Cod. 126. Shortly before the quotation (p. 61) from Africanus, Basil says that Origen's opinions concerning the Holy Spirit were not in all respects sound: *πλὴν ἀλλὰ πολλαχοῦ καὶ αὐτός, τῆς συνηθείας τὸ ἰσχυρὸν δυσωπούμενος, τὰς εὐσεβεῖς φωνὰς ἀφῆκε περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος*. Comp. with Cod. 126 (*vid. sup.* p. 249). The general parallel and ring of the sentence have to be considered, as well as the verbal coincidences.

3. We have now to show that we have good reason for believing that the close of *De Spir. Sanct.* belongs to our group of writings.

In the words last quoted we observe *συνήθεια*. This word comes up again and again in the chapters before us. Thus we find it very early in c. xxix. :—

ἀπαριθμήσομαι οὖν ὑμῖν τοὺς προστάτας (first use of the word) τοῦ λόγου· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἡμῶν ὥρμηται πρῶτον, πύθεν; χθιζοί τινες ὄντως ἡμεῖς, κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Ἰωβ λόγον, πρὸς γε τοσοῦτον χρόνον, τὸν τῆς συνηθείας ταύτης ἡλικιώτην. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν αὐτός, εἰ χρή με τοῦμὸν ἴδιον εἰπεῖν, ὥσπερ τινὰ κληῖρον πατρῶον τὴν φωνὴν ταύτην διαφυλάττω, παραλαβὼν κ.τ.λ.

Diodorus, in the pages already so familiar to us, has a noticeable passage :—

ἀλλ' ὁμως οἱ κατοικοῦντες . . . οὐχ οἷον φεύγειν βούλονται . . . ἔνεκα τοῦ μὴ βιασθῆναι διαίτης ἑτέρας καὶ βίου πειραθῆναι. οὕτως αὐτοφύες¹ ἔχει τι φίλτρον πᾶσα συνήθης (obs.) χώρα, καὶ περιγίνεται τῆς ἐκ τῶν ἀέρων κακοπαθείας ὁ χρόνος (obs.), ὁ τὴν ἐκ νηπίου παραλαβὼν (obs.) ἡλικίαν (obs.), p. 199.

Pseudo-Agatharchides writes :—

οὕτως ἔχει τι φίλτρον μέγα πᾶσα συνήθεια (obs.), καὶ νικᾷ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ περιέχοντος δυσχέρειαν ὁ χρόνος ὁ τὴν πρώτην (obs.) δεξάμενος εἰς τὸν βίον ἡλικίαν. c. xxxii.²

¹ Comp. τὸ δ' ἀπερίεργον (*vid.* Cod. 126, quoted on p. 249) εἰς ἀφροδίτην ἥδιον μαῖλλον τοῦ πολυπράγμονος. αὐτοφύη γὰρ ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν. Achill. Tat. v. 27.

² This chapter is headed: "*Quod non tanta locorum sit distantia, quanta morum.*" Just above, the writer uses 1 Cor. xii. as we have shown on p. 224. Here he seems to have 1 Cor. xiii. in mind (*vid.* Basil, quoted on p. 260). Just above the words now quoted he has *ἀλλ' ἔμωσ, τοσαύτης οὐσης τῆς τοπικῆς διαστάσεως, ἀνυπέρβλητον ἔχουσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους* (one would expect *ἀγάπην*) . . . τὴν διαφοράν, ὥστε μὴδὲ πιστεύεισθαι παρ' ἑτέροις τὰ παρ' ἄλλοις συνήθη τε καὶ ὁμολογούμενα, μὴδὲ στέγειν κ.τ.λ. Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 7 πάντα στέγει, πάντα πιστεύει. *Vid. sup.* p. 264, where a coincidence is shown, in which ἀνυπέρβλητος is concerned, with the very place of Basil where 1 Cor. xiii. is used. Of the use of this chapter we shall have a curious confirmation presently (p. 275). The thing is of importance only as showing that the same hand is at work.

If we can find another passage in *De Spir. Sanct.* c. xxix. which takes us to exactly the same spot in Diodorus and the excerpts from Agatharchides, the two passages will support one another in their seeming use of Diodorus.

We shall now give the second example of the use of προστάτης. Basil writes : πῶς οὖν καινοτόμος ἐγώ, καὶ νεωτέρων ῥημάτων δημιουργός . . . καὶ ἔθος πάσης μνήμης ἀνθρωπίνης πρεσβύτερον, καὶ ἄνδρας . . . προστάτας τῆς φωνῆς παρεχόμενος ; with τὸ ἐκ τῆς λέξεως χρήσιμον four lines above, and ὡς ἔμοιγε οὐδὲν φοβερώτερον nine lines below. In *Bibl.* 213, Photius (?) describes the writings of Agatharchides (obs.), and says, ἀλλ' εἰ τις ἄλλος δημιουργός τῆς περὶ τὰς λέξεις χρήσεως, and after two lines ὡς τὴν τε καινοτομίαν μὴ δοκεῖν εἶναι καινοτομίαν, καὶ τὸ σαφὲς οὐκ ἔλαττον τῶν ἐξ ἔθους λέξεων παρέχειν (ending a sentence, obs.), with ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ οὐδὲν ἔλαττον a few lines below, and εἰς μνήμην ἀνάγει, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πεπαῦσθαι τοῦ γράφειν διὰ τινάς τε αἰτίας κ.τ.λ. a few lines above. Comp. these last words with the ὣν ἡ πρώτη δι' αἰτίας αὐτοὺς ἄγει . . . παύσασθαι τοῦ κακοῦ in the opening lines of *Cod.* 126, quoted on p. 248. The resemblances between *Cod.* 126 and *Cod.* 213 are perfectly natural, and indicate the same hand. But the resemblances between Basil and *Cod.* 213 are precisely of the same character, and in fairness should be held to point to the same conclusion. There is evidence close at hand to show that this is the necessary conclusion.

Seeing that Agatharchides appears to be in Basil's mind, it is natural to consider whether we can observe at this point any recollections of the forged excerpts from Agatharchides. The eye falls almost directly upon the words ἐν Πνεύματι πραότητος καὶ ἀγάπης κατασταλῆναι· εἰ δ' ἄρα παντελῶς ἐξηγριῶνται καὶ ἀτιθάσσεύτως ἔχουσιν. The word ἀτιθάσσευτος is not common. In *Cod.* 250, c. xxxviii., just above the account of the "carnivorous bull," we find ἄγριον δὲ ὑπερβολῇ καὶ τελείως ἀτιθάσσευτον, καὶ τὴν ὄψιν ἐμφαίνον ἀπὸ τε τῶν ὀφρύων καὶ τῶν ὀμμάτων αὐστηράν. Comp. with Basil. The latter part of the sentence has been quoted on p. 100, in illustration of the very passage from the *Evang. Thom.* which we have found a little while ago to be so closely connected with Clement (*vid. sup.* p. 255). It will be remembered that the close connection between these forged excerpts and Clement

has been several times pointed out. Now, observe, if we turn to Diodorus (iii. 35) we find ἀγριώτατα δὲ ταῦτα τὰ ζῶα καὶ παντελῶς ἀτιθάσσευτα τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφρύων πρόσοψιν αὐστηροτέραν ἔχει. (See note on p. 268.) The παντελῶς tells a tale. A few lines below, in the account of the bull,¹ Diodorus has the word φοβερώτερος, which we have just seen in Basil, whose sentence we will quote, together with a few additional words:—

ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸ πολεμικὸν τοῦτο καθ' ἡμῶν συγκεκίνηται στίφος. πᾶσα δὲ πόλις καὶ κώμη, καὶ ἐσχατιαὶ πᾶσαι, πλήρεις τῶν ἡμετέρων διαβολῶν, and after two lines πρὸς τούτοις καὶ ξίφος στίλβουσθω, καὶ πέλεκυς ἀκονάσθω, καὶ πῦρ καίεσθω τοῦ Βαβυλωνίου σφοδρότερον, καὶ πᾶν κινείσθω ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὄργανον κολαστήριον· ὥς ἔμοιγε οὐδὲν φοβερώτερον κ.τ.λ.

The excerpt does not use φοβερώτερος where Diodorus does. A few lines below, however, where Diodorus has nothing of the kind, the excerpt has σφοδρότερον, and after two lines πρᾶον (obs.) τὸν ἄγριον, ὥστε μηθὲν τῶν ἄλλων νομίζειν μῆτε ἡμερώτερον μῆτε φοβερώτερον. Comp. with Basil. We turn back again in the excerpts to cc. xxxiii., xxxiv. (same p. 455), which we shall give entire:—

c. xxxiii. ὅτι οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀραβίαν λέοντες, φησί, ψιλότεροι μὲν εἰσι καὶ θρασύτεροι, τῷ χρώματι δὲ ὁμαλοὶ καθάπερ οἱ γινόμενοι περὶ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν (obs.) οὕτω δὲ τοῖς τριχώμασι στίλβοντες (obs.) ὥστε ἀπὸ τῶν αὐχένων ξανθότητα ἀπολάμπειν χρυσοῦ παραπλήσιαν. c. xxxiv. (περὶ μυρμηκογέντων) τῶν δὲ καλουμένων μυρμηκῶν οἱ μὲν πλεῖστοι κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν τῶν λοιπῶν οὐδὲν παραλλάττουσι, τὴν δὲ τῶν αἰδοίων φύσιν ἀπεσ-
τραμμένην ἔχουσιν, ἐναντίαν τοῖς ἄλλοις.

These words, which follow those quoted on p. 271, have nothing answering to them in Diodorus; but since the writer has been using iii. 34, and goes on to use c. 35, we turn to Diodorus, and find τὸ πῦρ, τὰς ἐσχατίας, and ξίφει. Comp. with Basil. We do not see πέλεκυς, but we observe that the elephant is here spoken of, and that the word ἔξαιμος is used both in Diodorus and the excerpts, which occurs, as we have had occasion to point out, in the account of the elephant hunters (*vid. sup.* p. 62), as given in the excerpt. We remember that there great stress is laid upon the exceeding

¹ Diodorus has here also ἀπάτης. This ἀπάτης is the very word taken by Tatius (*vid. sup.* p. 225). Basil has it exactly a few lines below the passage now in hand. In the excerpts we also observe πλὴν ὅτι. See Cod. 126.

sharpness of the *πέλεκυς*. These things lead us to look somewhat closer at the various passages before us. We observe that Diodorus says that the inhabitants of the country which he describes do not seek to escape the evils which surround them, but willingly bear them *ἐνεκα τοῦ μὴ βιασθῆναι διαίτας ἐτέρας καὶ βίου πειραθῆναι. οὕτως αὐτοφυῆς ἔχει τι φίλτρον πᾶσα συνήθης χώρα* (*vid. sup.* p. 271). The words are taken over as we see in a somewhat altered form by the writer of the excerpts. They are words likely to attract attention, and Wesseling quotes Ovid in illustration of them. Tatius, moreover, seems to have used them (*vid. sup.* p. 271 n.). They very obviously, however, suggest Daniel, and the *οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας παῖδες*, as Basil calls them, as we shall see presently. Now, observe, exactly at this point the writer of the excerpts breaks the thread of his connection with Diodorus, and interpolates an account of the Arabian lions, being careful to tell us that they are more fierce than the Babylonian lions. He thought it unnecessary to describe these last. Does he refer to those well-known lions of sacred story? A few lines above the writer uses the word *ἐνδελεχῶς*. It is not in Diodorus, but it occurs several times in the narrative of Daniel and the den of lions.

Now it must be observed that the writer of the excerpts goes on immediately to speak *περὶ μυρμηκολέοντων*. This is thoughtful of him, for in LXX. Job iv. 11, where *μυρμηκολέων* is found, the meaning is not understood.

Strabo, in *lib.* xvi. p. 474, writes thus: *πληθύνει δ' ἐλέφασιν ἡ χώρα (ἀπὸ τῆς Δειρῆς μέχρι Νότου κέρως) καὶ λένουσι τοῖς καλουμένοις μύρμηξιν· ἀπεστραμμένα δ' ἔχουσι τὰ αἰδοῖα * καὶ χρυσοειδεῖς τὴν χροάν, ψιλότεροι δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀραβίαν*. Here then is the greater part of the language of the two excerpts, which are obviously manufactured¹ out of Strabo, with some little assistance from other sources. In *lib.* xvii. 42, Ælian has *ἐν τῇ Βαβυλωνίᾳ* (obs.) *γῆ γίνονται μύρμηκες κ.τ.λ.* He goes on to speak of the *πάρδαλις* and then of the *ρίνοκέρως*. The editors suppose that he copied Agatharchides. Ælian, in describing the fight between the elephant and the rhinoceros, uses the word *πέλεκυς*, as the writer of the excerpt does not. Comp. with Basil.

¹ This proves quite decisively that the excerpts from Agatharchides are forgeries.

The history of the two excerpts is now sufficiently explained. The language is taken from Strabo and Ælian. The *Βαβυλωνία* of the latter, together with the passage quoted above from Diodorus, suggested the reference first to Dan. i., then to Dan. vi. Now, observe, in Dan. i. 14 we are told that the chief of the eunuchs *ἐπείρασεν* (obs.) Daniel and his friends, and in ver. 15 that after a trial of ten days, when *αἱ ἰδέαι αὐτῶν* were compared with those of the other youths, the comparison was in favour of Daniel and his friends. Comp. the *κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν τῶν λοιπῶν* of pseudo-Agatharchides.

There seems, therefore, to be some good reason for conjecturing that the reference to the Babylonian lions in the excerpt is only a sneering glance at the lions which spared the life of Daniel. This makes the coincidence with Basil more noticeable. If pseudo-Agatharchides was the writer of the chapters of Basil's *De Spir. Sanct.* now under consideration, the coincidences which have been pointed out would have a natural explanation.

On the use of *στίλβειν* we shall have something to say hereafter (p. 289).

The other reference to the Babylonian youths is this:—

τούτων μὲν οὖν πάντων ἕνεκεν σιωπᾶν ἔδει, ἀλλ' ἀνθεῖλκε γὰρ ἑτέρωθεν ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐ ζητοῦσα τὸ ἑαυτῆς, καὶ νικᾶν ἀξιοῦσα πάσαν καιρῶν καὶ πραγμάτων δυσχέρειαν. ἐδίδαξαν δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας παῖδες, καὶ μηδενὸς ὄντος τοῦ συντιθεμένου τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ, καθ' ἑαυτοὺς τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἐκτελεῖν· οἳ γε μέσης τῆς φλογὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀνύμνου, μὴ λογιζόμενοι τὸ πλήθος τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀθετούντων, ἀλλ' ἀλλήλοις ἀρκοῦμενοι, τρεῖς ὄντες. *De Spir. Sanct.* xxx.

This passage we shall find presently to be of considerable importance.¹ Meanwhile, comp. with pseudo-Agath., and observe the use of 1 Cor. xiii. 5 οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς . . . οὐ λογίζεται κ.τ.λ. (*vid. sup.* p. 271 n.).

If we return to Cod. 213 we observe a somewhat noticeable sentence: ἀλλ' ἡ ἀπὸ πραγμάτων ἑτέρων εἰς ἕτερα . . . μετὰ-

¹ It will perhaps be well so far to anticipate what is to follow, as to quote the passage to which Basil (?) is indebted: τῶν καθ' αὐτοὺς καιρῶν . . . ἔτι δ' οἱ μὲν τὰς παλαιὰς μυθολογίας διὰ τὴν δυσχέρειαν τῆς πραγματείας ἀπειδοκίμασαν. οἱ δὲ τὴν ὑπόστασιν τῆς ἐπιβολῆς οὐ συντίλειςαν μεσολαβήσαντες κ.τ.λ. Diod. i. 3. We shall find presently that these words are used by another writer in a passage closely connected with *De Spir. Sanct.* xxx. Basil certainly never wrote a sentence made up of the language of S. Paul and of Diodorus.

βασίς. The man that wrote these words might well have composed the opening sentence of the following passage from the same chapter of Basil's treatise:—

μετάβα δὴ μοι ἀπὸ τῆς εἰκόνος ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦ κακοῦ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, οὐχὶ πάλαι μὲν πως ἐδόκει τὸ Ἀρειανὸν σχίσμα, εἰς ἀντίπαλον μοῖραν ἀποκριθὲν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν πολεμίων τάξει αὐτὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸ μόνον ἀντικαθέζεσθαι; ὅτε δὲ ἐκ τῆς μακρᾶς καὶ χαλεπῆς ἔριδος εἰς προφανῇ ἡμῶν ἀγῶνα ἀντικατέστησεν, τότε δὴ εἰς πολλὰ μέρη κατὰ μυρίους τρόπους ὁ πόλεμος διεσχίσθη. *De Spir. Sanct.* xxx., with . . . φερομένης, τοὺς ἐπιβάτας ἀλλήλοις τῆς τῶν πρωτείων ἔριδος μὴ ὑφίστασθαι as the preceding words.

In Cod. 213, the writer says that Agatharchides was a *ζηλωτῆς Θουκυδίδου*. He had in his mind perhaps Luc. *Quom. Hist.* 15 ἕτερος δὲ Θουκυδίδου *ζηλωτῆς ἄκρος, οἶος, εὖ μάλα τῷ ἀρχετύπῳ* (obs.) *εἰκασμένος, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὡς ἐκείνος, σὺν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ὀνόματι ἥρξατο κ.τ.λ.* We have had an interesting illustration of pseudo-Agatharchides' method of using Thucydides on p. 237. Pseudo-Basil (as we shall now call him) was also an admirer and copyist of Thucydides. In *lib. i. 3* we remark οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ βαρβάρους εἶρηκε διὰ τὸ μηδὲ Ἑλληνᾶς πῶ ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἀντίπαλον ἐς ἓν ὄνομα ἀποκεκρίσθαι. Comp. with pseudo-Basil, and note his *πως ἐδόκει*. Thucydides has *ἐπαγομένων* a few lines above, and pseudo-Basil *ἐπαγόμεναι* a few lines below. The writer obviously uses Thucydides for the mere sake of his Greek. From this passage alone we might dismiss the idea that Basil wrote the later chapters of the work which bears his name. Comp. the note on p. 275.

We may now profitably compare pseudo-Basil's first sentence (with its resemblance to Cod. 213) with Basil's words in this same *De Spir. Sanct.*: οὔτε γὰρ τὸ κράτος σχίζεται, οὔτε ἡ δόξα διαμερίζεται (obs. how pseudo-Basil's *διεσχίσθη* is obtained). ὥς γὰρ ἡ κρατοῦσα ἡμῶν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία μία, οὕτω καὶ ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν δοξολογία μία (perhaps suggesting c. xxix.), καὶ οὐ πολλαί· διότι ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει. Of these last words pseudo-Basil's first words appear to be an imitation. The peculiar use of Thucydides in pseudo-Basil's next words confirms this notion. Pseudo-Basil's imitation of Basil is exactly such as we should expect to find from the pen of a writer on whose mind Basil's words had been specially impressed from his own (perhaps jesting) use of them. This writer we can produce. In the middle of *Theoph.* xxx., a

section to which attention has been particularly called on p. 118 sq., the writer has *κατὰ τὸν μέγαν Βασίλειον ὅτι ἡ τῆς εἰκόνης τιμὴ κ.τ.λ.* A few lines above the writer has *ἀκατάπαυστος ὁ θυμὸς τοῦ ἀντιπάλου* (obs.) *διαβόλου κατὰ τῆς ἀγίας εἰκόνης* (obs.) *κ.τ.λ.* The words follow those quoted on p. 267, and *ἀκατάπαυστος* is taken from the liturgy of S. Mark.

We shall now bring upon the scene a writer to whom reference has been occasionally made, a fifteenth century "Thucydides Ecclesiasticus," as he has been called, who begins his Ecclesiastical History with *Νικηφόρος ὁ Καλλίστου τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἱστορίαν συντάξεν, ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐπιφανείας Χριστοῦ, λογισάμενος γενναίαν μάλα καὶ ἀξίαν λόγου ἔσσεσθαι τὴν σπουδὴν*, in imitation of Thucydides' opening words: *Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον . . . ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεννημένων*. Having begun with Thucydides, Nicephorus turns to the opening pages of Diodorus' *Bibliotheca*. He does not transfer Diodorus' sentences bodily into his own columns, nor does he simply imitate them. He recasts them. He goes to them for his Greek, and is indebted to them for the most common words. The comparison of his pages with those of Diodorus is singularly instructive, and proves conclusively that a writer of his day did not always trust to his own knowledge of the Greek language, but did, at any rate sometimes, build up his sentences out of the words and scraps of sentences gathered, perhaps from one page of a Greek author, perhaps from several, with the occasional admixture of language borrowed from other sources. His third sentence runs thus: *ἔγωγ' οὖν μεγίστην χάριν ὁμολογεῖν οἴομαι δεῖν τοῖς τὰς κοινὰς ἱστορίας ἰδίαν πραγματείαν πεποιημένοις· ἐπεὶ τοί γε τὸ φιλότιμον οὐ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ τὸν βίον ὠφελεῖν ἤρεθίσαντο, ὑπουργοὶ τινες τῷ ὄντι θείας προνοίας ἀναδεικνύμενοι, ὥς ὑπὸ μίαν πραγματείαν τὰς διαφόρους πράξεις καθάπερ εἰς τι κοινὸν ταμιεῖον ἀπογραψάμενοι*.

Diodorus begins his work thus: *τοῖς τὰς κοινὰς ἱστορίας πραγματευσαμένοις μεγάλας χάριτας ἀπονέμειν δίκαιον πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ὅτι τοῖς ἰδίους πόνοις ὠφελῆσαι τὸν κοινὸν βίον ἐφιλοτιμήθησαν*. After a few lines Diodorus has *ἐφιλοτιμήθησαν ὑπὸ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν σύνταξιν ἀγαγεῖν, ὥσπερ τινες ὑπουργοὶ*

τῆς θείας προνοίας γενηθέντες, and after four lines οἱ τε τὰς κοινὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης πράξεις, καθάπερ μιᾶς (obs.) πόλεως, ἀναγράψαντες, ἓνα (obs.) λόγον καὶ κοινὸν χρησματοστήριον τῶν συντετελεσμένων ἀπέδειξαν τὰς ἑαυτῶν πραγματείας, . . . κατὰ τὸν βίον ἔχουσιν. Observe the little joke in καθάπερ εἰς τι (εἷς, μία, ἓν), and the interchange (a common trick with our writers) of prepositions in composition. Nicephorus paused a while over Diodorus' χρησματοστήριον. Wesseling might have quoted him as favouring the meaning of *ærarium*, which he himself prefers, for in *lib.* xiv. 47, Diodorus ἀποδείξει τὴν Δῆλον κοινὸν ταμιεῖον, καὶ τὰ χρήματα τὰ συναγόμενα εἰς ταύτην κατατίθεται.

On the next page (p. 34) Nicephorus has οὐ μὴν καὶ πρὸς τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον παντάπασιν ἐξεργάσθαι τὰς αὐτῶν πραγματείας ἐδοκιμάσαμεν. . . . τῷ τῆς πίστεως λόγῳ, καὶ πρὸς ἀντίπαλον (obs.) ἐκεῖνα καταστήναι μοῖραν (obs.)· καὶ ἐς ὕστερον τὰ εἰκότα φρονῆσαι ξυνέβη, τῇ πρὸς οὓς διαφέροντο ἔριδι (obs.) τὰ πολλὰ (obs.) παραλελειπότες· οὐδὲ οὗτοι ἔμπεδον ἀκραιφνῶς τὸ ἀξιόπιστον ἔχουσιν, καίτοι γε ἄλλως, λόγου δυνάμει κρατοῦντες καὶ τῷ τῆς γραφῆς βάθει, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῷ περὶ Χριστὸν πόθῳ καὶ ζήλῳ, τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τὸ πρωτεῖον (obs.) φέρειν (obs.) διενιστάμενοι. Compare with pseudo-Basil. Thucydides has ὕστερον in the next line, and κοινῇ ἐργασαμένη a little above in the same § 3. The writer of *Theophilus* has ἀκραιφνεστάτου a few lines after, and ἀκραιφνεστάτου πίστεως a few lines before the passage quoted from Basil in § 30. In his *Dedicatio* (p. 20) Nicephorus has ἔχειν εἰκόνας ἀρχέτυπον, with τῶν πρωτείων a few lines above. Compare with pseudo-Basil.

We must now consider how far Nicephorus is indebted to Diodorus.

On p. 6, Diodorus has ἔτι δ' οἱ μὲν . . . διὰ τὴν δυσχέρειαν τῆς πραγματείας (obs.) ἀπεδοκίμασαν (obs.). οἱ δὲ τὴν ὑπόστασιν τῆς ἐπιβολῆς οὐ συνετέλεσαν (on p. 35, Nicephorus has τὸ τῆς πραγματείας δυσχερὲς ὑπολογισάμενοι, and τὴν τῆς ἐπιβολῆς ὑπόστασιν ἥκιστα συνετέλεσαν), and, a few lines above, οὐ μὴν ἐξεργάσθαι πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον. Above, again, but on p. 5, he has λόγου δύναμιν . . . ἓνα τῶν πολλῶν . . . ὥς τοῦτο τὸ πρωτεῖον τῇ ἀρετῇ περιπεποιημένους. εἰς πλείω δὲ μέρη τούτου διηρημένου, συμβαίνει κ.τ.λ. Compare with Diodorus' τὸ πρωτεῖον . . . εἰς πλείω δὲ μέρη τούτου διηρουμένου, pseudo-Basil's τῶν

πρωτείων . . . τότε δὲ εἰς πολλὰ μέρη . . . δισχίσθη (*vid. sup.* p. 276).

We have thus, then, now before us a passage from pseudo-Basil which appears not to be independent of a passage in Nicephorus. The latter writer uses Diodorus, and takes τὸ πρωτεῖον from him. This word forms part of the coincidence between pseudo-Basil and Nicephorus. The line following πρωτεῖον in Diodorus supplies a coincidence with pseudo-Basil. Is it possible to come to any other conclusion, than that pseudo-Basil and Nicephorus are but different names for the same person? This conclusion is supported by the examination of the passage from pseudo-Basil, which stands upon p. 275. The note below shows that it is indebted to the very words of Diodorus which Nicephorus uses. We have just given his manipulation of the passage. It contains the word ὑπολογισάμενοι. Comp. pseudo-Basil's μὴ λογιζόμενοι, for whose ἀξιοῦσα Nicephorus has a parallel καταξιοῦσα (*vid. infr.* p. 286). It is perfectly plain that the close of *De Spir. Sanct.* was not written by Basil, but belongs to our "group of writings." This necessary conclusion gives immense force to the arguments under the other two heads of this section. The writer of the spurious addition to Basil's treatise had perhaps several objects in view. The evidence against the genuineness of Clement's Epistles has been continually accumulating, and will continue to accumulate even to the very last sentence that we write. They must be forgeries, and if they are, we cannot doubt that c. xxix. was added to Basil's treatise that the quotation from Clement which it contains might support the forged epistle. The genuineness of Phot. *Bibl.* 126 cannot be maintained. The epistles, the description of them in the *Bibliotheca*, the quotation from them in *De Spir. Sanct.*, are all alike frauds, and with these frauds Nicephorus Callistus, or whoever passes under his name, is very evidently connected.

§ 2.

Cod. 244.

This "codex" professes to give excerpts from Diodorus Siculus. It is very long, and no useful purpose would be served by discussing it from end to end. If one or two of the

excerpts can be proved to be frauds, the genuineness of the rest cannot be maintained. We shall content ourselves with discussing three.

1. The first two excerpts describe two *hermaphrodites*, Herais and Callo, and their change from women, as they were for some years supposed to be, to men. The accounts, which have been often referred to in the foregoing pages, appear to be mere jests. The main joke in each has been pointed out on p. 190. This view of these excerpts has been confirmed out of Tatius on pp. 214-216. Their connection with Clement's Epistles and other writings has been shown on pp. 89, 90, 148. The use of Apollodorus in them as well as in Tatius' love story has been pointed out on p. 218. It will not, we think, be necessary to do more than (1) to draw somewhat closer the connection which has been already pointed out between them and Aristophanes; and (2) briefly to show that they are indebted to Clement of Alexandria.

(1.) On p. 60, the connection between the *Evang. Thom.* and certain lines of Arist. *Plut.* is pointed out. From line 515, the words γῆς ἀρότροις ῥήξας are quoted, and the scholiast's remark δι' ἀρότρου σχίσας, τέμων τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν. Reference to p. 190 will show how these words are taken up in our excerpts.

On p. 46, the connection of Arist. *Nub.* 967-1066 with *Peregrinus* is pointed out, and on p. 61, with the *Evang. Thom.* On p. 202, the way in which the same lines appear to be used in the *Oratio* is shown. In line 947, Aristophanes has ῥῆξον φωνήν, ἥ τινα χαίρεις καὶ τὴν σαυτοῦ φύσιν εἰπέ, with δείξετον in 939. In the excerpts we are told that the judges were called together to decide whether Herais should go to the husband or remain with the father,—the change of sex being at that time unknown. The writer says πέρας τῶν κριτῶν οἰομένων δεῖν ἀκολουθεῖν τᾶνδρὶ τὴν γαμηθεῖσαν, τὴν ἀλήθειαν διασαφῆσαι τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἄρρεν, καὶ θυμῷ τετολμηκότι τὴν καθυποκρινομένην¹ ἐσθῆτα λύσασαν δείξαι πᾶσι, ῥῆξαί τε φωνὴν δεινοπαθοῦσαν, εἴ τινες ἀναγκάζουσι συνοικεῖν ἀνδρὶ τὸν ἄνδρα. Compare. In 351, where Aristophanes describes the various forms assumed

¹ Comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 7. 7, p. 684, καθυποκρινομένης ἁσχημόνως, καὶ τολμῶσης. The excerpt has τολμῶσης a few lines above. Josephus' account of Herod the Great is used in these excerpts as well as elsewhere. Nicephorus has μεγάλην ῥηγνύσα φωνήν in *Dedicat. H. E.* p. 2.

by the clouds, we find ἀποφαίνουσαι τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ, followed in 355 by καὶ νῦν, εἴπερ τινι (cf. εἴ τινες) καὶ ἄλλω (obs.) οὐρανομήκη ῥήξατε κάμοι φωνήν. The name of the second *hermaphrodite* is Callo. Here, again, as so often in these pages, it is the way in which these coincidences have been found, which is above all to be observed.

(2.) The first excerpt uses the rather uncommon word μεταμφιάσασθαι. It is not ill chosen. Ælian, *N. A.* i. 14, uses it of the chameleon. It is used also in pseudo-Eustathius' *Hexameron*, p. 770, in the writer's paraphrase of Gen. xxxviii., containing the story of Judah and Tamar. If our readers will compare pseudo-Eustathius with the excerpts, they will at once perceive the parody, and on closer examination find several coincidences.

On p. 745, pseudo-Eustathius speaks of the hyæna, and takes over a considerable portion of the remarks of Clement of Alexandria in *Pæd.* ii. 10, p. 222. Clem. Alex. speaks of the hyæna in connection with the *hermaphrodite*. So does the writer of the excerpts, and his language shows a number of resemblances to Clement. Clement's remarks upon the hyæna are used, however, to adorn the filthy jokes which are pointed out on p. 190. It is unnecessary to refer to these at length. It will suffice to say that Clem. Alex., *speaking of the hyæna*, has δι' ἧς ἀποπτύεται τὰ περιπτώματα κ.τ.λ., and the excerpt, *speaking of the hermaphrodite*, an answering δι' ὧν ἐξωδεύοντο τὰ περιπτώματα κ.τ.λ., where, on δι' ὧν, Wesseling says, "δι' ἧς, nisi enallagen statuas, potius foret." We cannot think that anything further is necessary to prove that these two excerpts were not written by Diodorus.

Of the treatise bearing the name of Eustathius nothing whatever is known, except that it is most certainly spurious. It has been mentioned, in a note on p. 223, that Tatius' description of the method of capturing the rhinoceros is found almost word for word in this treatise. It has been shown that that description is part and parcel of Tatius' work. Pseudo-Eustathius¹ must therefore be held to have borrowed from Tatius, unless, indeed, we prefer to think that he is Tatius under another name.

¹ We ought, perhaps, to mention that pseudo-Eustathius (*Hexam.* p. 764, Migne) while quoting Josephus alters παραστάτης into προστάτης.

2. We shall now give some extracts out of Cod. 244, p. 381.

At the top of the page, Photius makes some remarks upon Diodorus' account of the manners and customs of the Jews. Then follows out of the 48th book an account of the death of Catulus; then from the 31st book an account of a Rhodian embassy to Rome; then from some part of the same book a few words to say that the Romans are very ready to praise one another; then, still from some part of the same book, an excerpt from Diodorus' account of Perseus, the last king of Macedonia. This excerpt speaks of the prison in which he was confined, and of the foul smell which arose from the number of prisoners which it contained. It concludes with the account of his death. This excerpt is nearly as long as the others, which we have mentioned, put together, and includes a few lines of p. 382:—

1. . . . ψευδολογῶν (Diodorus) τὰ πλεῖστα, καὶ διερχόμενος πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχους πάλιν ὧν κατεψεύσατο τῆς ἀληθείας . . . ἐπάγει γὰρ· Περὶ μὲν τῶν Ἰουδαίων Ἐκαταῖος ὁ Μιλήσιος ταῦτα ἰστόρηκεν.

E libro quadragesimo octavo.

2. "Ὅτι ὃ λέγεται συνενεχθῆναι αἴτιον θανάτου παρὰ τινων Ἰοβιανῶ τῷ βασιλεῖ, τὸ κατακοιμηθῆναι ἐν οἴκῳ νεωστὶ κεκονιαμένῳ, πυρὶ δὲ διὰ τὴν ψύξιν ὑποθερμαινομένῳ καὶ ἀτμοὺς ἀφίεντι τοὺς ἐκ τῆς νενοτισμένης κονίας, τοῦτο ἐκόντα ὑπελθεῖν ἱστορεῖ Διόδωρος Κάτλον κατὰ τοὺς πολλῶ παλαιότερους χρόνους. Φησὶ γὰρ ἐν μὴ λόγῳ πρὸς τῇ ἀρχῇ ὅτι οἱ περὶ τὸν Κίνναν καὶ Μάριον συνεδρεύσαντες μετὰ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἡγεμόνων ἐβουλευόντο ὅπως βεβαίως καταστήσωσι τὴν εἰρήνην· τέλος ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τῶν ἐχθρῶν καὶ δυναμένους ἀμφισβητῆσαι πραγμάτων πάντας ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅπως καθαρᾶς γενομένης τῆς ἰδίας αἰρέσεως καὶ μερίδος ἀδεῶς τὸ λοιπὸν, καὶ ὡς ἂν βούλωνται, μετὰ τῶν φίλων διοικῶσι τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. Εὐθὺς οὖν τῶν μὲν γεγενημένων συνθέσεων καὶ πίστεων ἡμέλησαν, σφαγαὶ δὲ τῶν καταψηφισθέντων αὐτοῖς ἄκριτοι καὶ πανταχοῦ ἐγίνοντο. Κόϊντος δὲ Λουτάτιος ὁ Κάτλος, τεθριαμβευκῶς μὲν ἐπισήμως ἀπὸ Κίμβρων, ἀγαπώμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν περιττώτερον, ὑπὸ τινος δημάρχου κατηγορίας ἐτύγχανεν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ θανάτου. Φοβούμενος δὲ τὸν ἐκ τῆς συκοφαντίας κίνδυνον ἤκειν εἰς τὸν Μάριον, δεόμενος τυχεῖν βοηθείας. Ὁ δὲ τὸ μὲν ἔμπροσθεν ἐγεγόνει φίλος, τότε δ' ἐκ τινος ὑποψίας ἄλλοτρίως ἔχων πρὸς αὐτὸν τοῦτο μόνον ἀπεκρίθη, Θανεῖν δεῖ. Καὶ ὁ Κάτλος ἀπογνοὺς κεν τὰς τῆς σωτηρίας ἐλπίδας, σπεύδων δὲ χωρὶς ὕβρεως καταστρέψαι τὸν βίον, ἑαυτὸν τοῦ ζῆν μετέστησεν ἰδίῳ τινὶ καὶ παρηλλαγμένῳ τρόπῳ. Συγκλείσας ἑαυτὸν εἰς οἶκον νεόχριστον, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς κονίας ἀναφορὰν¹

¹ The word is not commonly used in this sense. Comp. ἐκ τῆς ἀναφορᾶς τῶν ἀτμῶν. Pseudo-Eustath. *Hexæm.* p. 712.

πυρὶ καὶ καπνῷ συναυξήσας, τῇ τῆς ἀναπνοῆς φθορᾷ περιπινγῆς¹ γενόμενος ἀπήλλαξεν.

Ex tricesimo primo.

3. "Αμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις εἰς Ῥώμην παρεγένοντο πρεσβευταὶ Ῥοδίων, τὰς γεγενημένας διαβολὰς κατ' αὐτῶν ἀπολύσασθαι . . . μηδὲν δὲ ἀνύοντες ὧν ἐπρέσβευον εἰς ἀθυμίαν ἐνέπιπτον, καὶ μετὰ δακρύων ἐποιοῦντο τὰς ἐντεύξεις . . . πολλὰ δὲ πρὸς δέησιν καὶ παραίτησιν εἰπόντες, καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον κατὰ τὴν προοιμίαν τὸ κύκνειον ᾤσαντες, μόλις ἔλαβον ἀποκρίσεις, δι' ὧν τοῦ μὲν ὁλοσχεροῦς φόβου παρελύθησαν, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων πικρῶς ὠνειδίσθησαν.

4. . . . Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις πολιτεύμασι ζηλοτυποῦσιν ἀλλήλους, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ ἐπαινοῦσιν. Ἐξ οὗ συμβαίνει μάλιστα τοὺς μὲν πράσσειν τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν ἔργων, ἀμιλλωμένους αὖξιν τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἀδικοδοξοῦντας καὶ τὰς ἀλλήλων ἐπιβολὰς λυμαιομένους βλάπτειν τὴν πατρίδα.

5. . . . τῶν κατὰ πόλιν στρατηγῶν εἷς ἐνέβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ἐν Ἀλβαῖς κάρκαρον μετὰ τῶν τέκνων. ἔστι δὲ ὁ κάρκαρος ὄρυγμα κατάγειον βαθύ, τὸ μὲν μέγεθος ἔχον οἴκου μάλιστά πως ἐννεακλίνου, σκότου δὲ πλήρες καὶ δυσσομίας διὰ τὸ πλήθος τῶν παραδεδομένων εἰς τοῦτον τὸν τόπον ἀνδρῶν, . . . καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πᾶσαν χρεῖαν ἀνηκόντων πάντων ἐν ταῦτῳ πεφυρμένων τοσαύτην προσπίπτειν δυσωδίαν συνέβαινε, ὥστε μηδὲνα τῶν προσιόντων ῥαδίως δύνασθαι καρτερῆσαι . . . συμπαθεῖς γὰρ οὗτοι γινόμενοι . . . διετῇ γὰρ χρόνον φιλοψυχήσας, καὶ προσκόψας τοῖς φυλάττουσι βαρβάρους, καλυόμενος ὑπ' ἐκείνων ὕπνου τυχεῖν ἐτελεύτησεν.

With No. 2, comp. Κάτλος δὲ Λουτάτιος, Μαρίῳ συνάρξας, καὶ συνθριαμβεύσας ἀπὸ Κίμβρων, ἐπεὶ πρὸς τοὺς δεομένους ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ παραιτουμένους ὁ Μάριος τοσοῦτον μόνον εἶπεν. Ἀποθανεῖν δεῖ· κατακλεισάμενος εἰς οἴκημα, καὶ πολλοὺς ἀνθράκας ἐκζωπυρίσας, ἀπεπνίγη. Plut. Mar. 44, p. 540. Obs. the δέησιν κ. παραίτησιν εἰπόντες of No. 3. Presently, but upon a different subject, Plutarch has εἰς ἀπορίας ἐνέπιπτε, and after two lines φοβούμενος τὰς ἀγρυπνίας, ἐνέβαλεν, with ἦκε in the next line but one. Comp. with Nos. 2, 3, and 5. Presently Plutarch (p. 543), speaking of the death of Marius, has καὶ πολλὰ φιλοψυχήσας μάτην . . . αὐτὸς αὐτὸν ἀπέκτεινεν. Comp. with No. 5. These coincidences show² that Plutarch and the

¹ This is a rare word. Pseudo-Agatharchides (c. xxxix.) follows Diodorus (iii. 35, p. 201, γίνεται περιπινγῆς, καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας οὐδαμῶς ἀλλάττεται (obs.) κ.τ.λ.) in using it of the death of the "carnivorous bull."

² The argument here is the same as that to which attention is particularly called on p. 222. If it were necessary, it would require nothing but more space than we have at command to show that both Achilles Tatius (v. 7) and the author of *Peregrinus* (§§ 23 sq., 38) make use of the same pages of Plutarch.

writer of the excerpts are not simply using the same source of information. The two writers are not independent of one another, and as Plutarch could not have used the excerpts, we must necessarily conclude that the writer of these borrowed from Plutarch, and therefore was not Diodorus.

Wesseling points out that in excerpt No. 3, the writer makes use of Polyb. *Reliq.* xxx. 4, ἐκ τῶν ἐντεύξεων καὶ κοινῇ . . . εἰς ἀθυρίαν . . . ἐνέπιπτον . . . ἀλλὰ δεῖσθαι μετὰ δακρύων . . . ὅτε δὴ κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν τὸ κύκνειον ἐξηγήσαντες, ἔλαβον ἀποκρίσεις τοιαύτας, δι' ὧν τοῦ μὲν ὀλοσχεροῦς φόβου τοῦ κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἐδόκουν παραλελῦσθαι· περὶ δὲ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐγκλημάτων αὐτοῖς ἡ σύγκλητος πικρῶς καὶ βαρέως ἀνείδισεν. Comp. with Nos. 3, 4, and notice the deliberate alteration of Polybius' language, so as to introduce the word μόλις. In § 5, Polybius has, in the same sentence, τὸ πολίτευμα . . . σχεδὸν τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων καὶ καλλίστων ἔργων, οὐκ ἐπεποιήτο πρὸς αὐτοὺς συμμαχίαν. Comp. with No. 4. Polybius' subject is very different from that of the excerpt. The latter appears to be indebted to Polybius here simply for words. This treatment confirms the opinion that the writer of the excerpt borrowed from Plutarch. These excerpts appear to be nothing but compilations, if not by Photius, then by some later hand. This is again confirmed by a fact, otherwise inexplicable, that accounts of the death of Jovianus and Catulus, found elsewhere, have, each of them, a special note of connection with the narrative in the excerpt. We will refer to several of these, and point out the special (only) connection in each.

In Zonar. *Annal.* xiii. 14, we remark λέγεται . . . διὰ τὸ τοῦ ψύχους . . . ἐκ τῆς κοινίας.

In *Hist. Compend.* p. 540, Cedrenus supplies us with ἐκοιμήθη ἐν οἰκίσκῳ νεωστὶ κεκονιαμένῳ . . . ἀτμόν.

Nicephorus Callistus describes the death of Jovianus in *H. E.* x. 43. We observe νοτὶς (cf. with Photius' words) ἐκ τῶν νεοχρίστων (cf. with Diodorus') τοίχων . . . ἀναπνευστικούς (cf. ἀναπνοῆς), and after a few lines, but on a different subject, and in the beginning of the next book πρὸς φλόγα ἀφιέντα (cf. ἀφιέντι).

Νεόχριστος is a rare word. It is used in Appian's account of the death of Catulus (obs.); Κάτλος δ' ἐν οἰκίματι νεοχρίστῳ . . . ἐκὼν ἀπεπνίγη. *De Bell. Civ.* i. p. 395 (Steph.).

Comp. the *ἐκόντα* of the excerpt, which is Photius' not Diodorus' word. A little above Appian has *καὶ πολέμιος ἐψηφίζετο*, and after three lines, and in the sentence in which he introduces Catulus, *μετὰ τοσούσδε φόνους ἀκρίτους*. Comp. with No. 1. Plutarch has *σφαγή*, and as we have seen *κατακλεισάμενος*. The language of the excerpt, so far as it relates the death of Catulus, is now almost entirely accounted for.

We have shown that the excerpts are not honest extracts from Diodorus' writings, but manufactured out of Plutarch and Polybius, and, as it now appears, Appian, Zonaras, Cedrenus, and Nicephorus. Who compiled them? We venture to suggest that *νεόχριστος* points out Nicephorus, if that be the rightful name, as the author. For the compiler we want a man versed in history, both ecclesiastical and secular. Nicephorus answers to the description, and, if we are right in supposing him to have written the spurious close of Basil's treatise, sufficiently unscrupulous. We have some evidence to bring forward in support of this view.

Glycas (*Annal.* iii. p. 254) mentions, though he does not describe, the death of Jovianus. He says that he died *μέγα πένθος ἀφείς*. Comp. the *ἀφιέντα* of the excerpt which just now we supposed to be taken from Nicephorus. Glycas goes on immediately to say that Valentinianus came to the throne, and that his brother Valens was associated in power with him. This Valens he calls *αἰσχιστον*, saying that he burnt eighty priests who had been sent to him *πρεσβείας ἔνεκεν*. When Valens sought *συμμαχίαν*, Valentinianus *οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἔδωκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνείδισεν οὕτως εἶπεν* "It is not right to help a man who fights against God." Valens, Glycas goes on to say, *ὕπὸ πολέμιων ἐν ἀχαρῶνι πυρὶ παραδίδοται. ὁ δὲ μοναχὸς ἐκείνος Ἰσαάκιος ἐλέγχων μὲν αὐτόν, δεσμωθεὶς δὲ παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰρκτῇ παραδοθείς, ἀσφράνθη ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ τῆς δυσωδίας ἐκκαυθέντος ἐκείσε, ὡς εἴρηται ὁ μέντοι Οὐαλεντινιανὸς καὶ τὸν ἀγωγὸν ἀποδόμησε καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰσήγαγεν*. These things, including the death (obs.) of Jovianus, occupy twenty lines only. Comp. with Nos. 2, 3, 5, and notice that the sentence in No. 3 with *μόλις*, to which special attention was called on p. 284, has a parallel in Glycas in which *μόλις* is altered into *οὐ μόνον κ.τ.λ.* Observe also Polybius' *συμμαχίαν*.

If we turn to the parallel passage in Nicephorus, *H. E.* xi. 4, we find "the bringing in of the water" of which Glycas speaks (though attributed to Valens), and also mention of certain persons who came as suppliants to the king. It is said, ὁ δὲ καίπερ περιοργῆς ὢν, μόλις μὲν, ὅμως τὴν πρεσβείαν ἐδέχετο. Observe Nicephorus' μόλις.

Cedrenus, in the parallel passage, has (p. 546) Οὐαλεντινιανὸς δὲ ὠνείδισε (obs.) Οὐάλεντα τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὡς κακόδοξον (obs. the ἀδικοδόξουντας of No. 4), μὴ πέμψας αὐτῷ βοήθειαν . . . αἰτοῦντι (comp. with No. 2); and on p. 550, speaking of the δυσωδίαν of Valens' death, ἔχων (Valens) τὰς φρένας ἀσυμπαθεῖς καὶ παντὸς ἐλέους ἀλλοτρίας. Comp. with No. 5, and with συμπαθῆς δὲ πῶς εἰς ἔλεον ἄνθρωπος ἀκροατῆς ἀλλοτρίων κακῶν. Achill. Tat. iii. 14.

The coincidences pointed out, and specially those between Glycas and our excerpts, cannot have accidentally arisen. What is the meaning of them? It seems to us quite plain that Nicephorus did not content himself with simply drawing the parallel in No. 1 between the deaths of Jovianus and Catulus, but manufactured and arranged the following excerpts so as to suit the narrative which Glycas gives.

We have, of course, more evidence to adduce in proof that Nicephorus wrote the excerpts before us. In No. 3 is the expression πρὸς τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον. It is also among the words quoted from Niceph. (*H. E.* i. 1) on p. 278. Nicephorus writes: . . . λόγους εὖ ἤκουσι καὶ ἐγκωμίων στεφάνοις καταξιούσα,¹ ἀξιολόγους ἐργάζεται οἷς δῆτα καὶ τοὺς ἐπιγενομένους εὖ μάλα προτρέπεται, τῶν καλλίστων ἔργων (obs. these words, and comp. Polybius), καὶ ἧ̃ δοξάζειν (obs.) περὶ τὸ Θεῖον χρεῶν ἐπίσης ἐκείνοις ἀνθάπτεσθαι. . . . ἀποδοχῆς ἡξιώσαμεν οὐ μὴν καὶ πρὸς τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον (obs. these words), παντάπασιν ἐξεργάσθαι τὰς αὐτῶν πραγματείας ἐδοκιμάσαμεν. οὐ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν, μὴ τῷ ὑγιαίνοντι λόγῳ ξυμβαίνοντες (obs.) . . . ἀμφισβητοῦσιν (obs.) . . . τὴν προαίρεσιν καθαρὸς (obs.) Σακράτης, τὸ πέρας ἐκείνου ἀρχὴν τῶν ἰδίων (obs.) κ.τ.λ.

Comp. the ἀμφισβητῆσαι πραγμάτων πάντας ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅπως καθαρᾶς γενομένης τῆς ἰδίας of No. 2, and the ἐπαινοῦσιν . . . συμβαίνει . . . τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν ἔργων . . . τὸ κοινῇ συμ-

¹ Cf. the ἀξιούσα of pseudo-Bas., quoted on p. 275. He borrows from the passage of Diodorus which Nicephorus here uses, *vid. sup.* p. 279.

φέρον, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἀδικοδοξοῦντας καὶ τὰς ἀλλήλων ἐπιβολὰς λυμαينوμένους βλάπτειν τὴν πατρίδα of No. 4.

Nicephorus uses for the manufacture of his sentences Diodorus, p. 4, τοὺς δ' ἡγεμόνας τῷ διὰ τῆς δόξης (obs.) ἀθανατισμῶ προτρέπεται τοῖς καλλίστοις τῶν ἔργων (cf. the form of this expression with No. 4) ἐπιχειρεῖν. χωρὶς δὲ τούτων, τοὺς μὲν στρατιώτας τοῖς μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν ἐπαίνους (obs.) ἐτοιμοτέρους κατασκευάζει πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος (obs.) κινδύνους, and p. 5 τῶν δὲ ἄλλων (obs.) ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν . . . πάντες δὲ μεγάλων ἐπαίνων (obs.) ἡξιώθησαν, τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτῶν τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπαθανατιζούσης (vid. sup. p. 154). . . . τὰ πάντα τᾶλλα λυμαινόμενον (obs.) χρόνον ἔχει φύλακα τῆς αἰωνίου παραδόσεως τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις. . . . καὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀνδρας ἀξίους λόγου προσαγορεύομεν, ὡς τοῦτο τὸ πρωτεῖον τῆς ἀρετῆς περιπεποιημένους· εἰς πλείω δὲ μέρη τούτου διηρημένου, συμβαίνει (obs.) τὴν μὲν ποιητικὴν τέρπειν μᾶλλον ἢπερ ὠφελεῖν . . . τὰ δὲ μεμιγμένην ἔχιν τῷ συμφέροντι τὴν βλάβην (obs.) ἔνια δὲ κατεψεύσθαι τῆς ἀληθείας (comp. here with No. 1, p. 282), . . . ὀρᾶσθαι γὰρ αὐτὴν προτρεπομένην ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνην . . . ἐγκωμιάζουσιν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς . . . ἀποδοχῆς τυγχάνοντας . . . οὐ μὴν ἐξεργᾶσθαι πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον . . . τῆς πραγματείας ἀπδοκίμασαν. οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐπιβολὴν (obs.) κ.τ.λ. If these coincidences are considered, and the way in which they have been found, and the use of κοινῇ in the expression τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον, both by Nicephorus and the writer of the excerpts,—both writers having taken the τὸ συμφέρον (but not κοινῇ) from Diodorus,—the conclusion seems necessarily to follow, that Nicephorus, or whoever passes under that name, compiled the excerpts from Diodorus in Cod. 244, and is the interpolator of Photius' *Bibliotheca* of whom we are in search.

There are one or two other things still to be noticed. Our excerpt No. 4 appears to take the word συμβαίνει from Diodorus' συμβ. τὴν μὲν ποιητικὴν τέρπειν μᾶλλον ἢπερ ὠφελεῖν. Upon these words Wesseling says "Sequitur *Agatharchidem* De Mar. Rubr. p. 12 (c. v.) atque *Eratosthenem*, quem censuisse ποιητὴν πάντα ψυχαγωγίας στοχάζεσθαι οὐ διδασκαλίας tradit ac indignatur *Strabo*, i. p. 13 (p. 7) B., and p. 28 (p. 15) B." Now, it will be seen from our p. 147 that ψυχαγωγίαν has found its way into the second *Preface* to the *Sacr. Par.*, and from p. 148 that this word forms part of the coinci-

dence with Cod. 244 ἀναγραφῆς ἡξιώσαμεν, οὐ ψυχῶν. κ.τ.λ. Here in Diodorus is the word ἡξιώθησαν. We have seen that Nicephorus altered that word into ἡξιώσαμεν, which is the exact word of Cod. 244. This supports the conclusion as to the authorship at which we have just arrived.

If our readers will turn to Phot. *Bibl.* 250, c. v., they will see that the passage out of which Wesseling has given some words—it is too long for quotation—is so transparently an imitation of Strabo as to be almost sufficient in itself to prove that Agatharchides did not write the excerpts which bear his name.

We believe that we have now with sufficient clearness brought home the authorship of a certain portion of Phot. *Bibl.* 244 to the person who passes under the name of Nicephorus Callistus. We cannot suppose that this was the extent of his misdeeds. We must naturally believe him to have written some, if not all, of the other spurious “codices” which have been pointed out. But those “codices” are so inextricably mixed up with the other writings which have been examined, that it seems necessary to suppose that Nicephorus had some hand in those writings. Accordingly, we have found good reason for concluding him to have been the author of the spurious addition to Basil’s *De Spir. Sanct.* The type of person who is required, by the evidence which has been brought forward, as the author (there may have been more than one) of our “group of writings” is a man of wide reading, an imitator, a plagiarist, a scholar, and yet content to pick to pieces the pages of an author, and to use the materials in his own composition. Such, undeniably, was Nicephorus. We believe that we might safely leave the matter here. As, however, we have accumulated a large amount of evidence tending to connect him very closely with those spurious writings which have been in our hands, we shall bring forward a few out of the multitude of coincidences which we observe in his *Proœmium* (*H. E.* i. 1) and *Dedicatio*.

1. The pages of Diodorus which Nicephorus uses are those to which the *Prefaces* to the *Sacra Parallela* of John of Damascus have been shown to be indebted. In fact, some of Diodorus’ language, which is quoted on pp. 156, 157, is used by Nicephorus. Thus he has ἡ δὲ, ὥς γε οἶμαι, καὶ μάλα

πλεῖστα μὲν ὠφελῆσαι δυνηθεῖν τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας, ἐλάχιστα δ' ἐνοχλήσει τοῖς περὶ αὐτὴν ἐλομένοις ἔχειν διατριβήν. Diodorus (p. 7) has τὰ πλεῖστα μὲν ὠφελῆσαι δυνάμενην, ἐλάχιστα κ.τ.λ. The rest of the sentence is quoted on p. 156. Nicephorus concludes his chapter with ἐπεὶ δ' ἡμῖν ὑπόθεσις αὕτη, δεῖ δὲ σαφηνείας χάριν καὶ τινα περὶ τῆς ὅλης πραγματείας προδιορίσαι ἰστέον, ὡς ἡ μὲν βίβλος πᾶσα εἰς τόμους ἡμῖν διήρηται ἡ'. Diodorus has περὶ ὅλης τῆς πραγματείας immediately after the προδιορίσαι given on p. 157. Finding then, as we do, that these two writers (if they be two) make use of the same sentences of Diodorus, is it not natural to conclude that Nicephorus' ἰστέον ὡς here before us forms a true note of connection with the *Prefaces*, seeing that the expression is found in them and not in Diodorus? Both writers have βουλομένοις (p. 147) and κατάληψιν (p. 156), but not Diodorus. The one has εὐληπτος (p. 156), the other δύσληπτος. Both of them are looking at the same passage, but Diodorus uses neither word. Nicephorus has ὅφ' ὁδηγοῦντι Θεῷ, and the second *Preface* λέξις ὁδηγοῦσα, with εὐστόχως a few lines above where the writer is contrasting his own weakness with divine help. In the beginning of his *Dedicatio* Nicephorus has ὁδηγουμένου, with εὐστόχως in the next line.

2. In *Appendix A* (p. 341) we have supposed Clement to use some words in Diodorus' pp. 6, 7. We shall continue the passage from p. 6: τῶν ἱστοριογραφῶν οὐδεὶς ἐπεβάλετο αὐτὰς μιᾶς συντάξεως περιγραφῇ πραγματεύσασθαι. Nicephorus has τῶν δὲ καθεξῆς χρόνων τὰς ἱεράς πράξεις ἄχρι δὴ καὶ ἐς δεῦρο, καίπερ πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας οὕσας καὶ οὐχ ἥττον ἢ ἐκεῖναι, οὐδενὶ πω τῶν εὖ ἱστορεῖν εἰδόντων εἰς νοῦν ἐγένετο μιᾶ περιγραφῇ συντάξεως ἐκεῖνας τε καὶ ταύτας ὅφ' ἐν πραγματεύσασθαι. Cf. p. 341.

3. On p. 273 the words of pseudo-Basil and pseudo-Agatharchides are compared. Both of them use στίλβειν. Nicephorus uses this word, and seems unable to shake himself free from pseudo-Agatharchides' language. Thus in *Dedic.* p. 25, we find χρυσοῦ περιλάμψειν ἡδὺ τι στιλβόντων, on p. 18 στιλβον, ἃ καὶ ἐς τρίχα. Comp. with pseudo-Agath. On p. 3 we observe κοινὴ ἐστία . . . ληστρικὸν ἐκεῖθεν ἡλαύνετο, φρίζαν ὥσπερ καὶ συντριβέν, and after one line ἅτε δὴ τῇ στιλβουμένη κατ' αὐτῶν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ (comp. pseudo-Bas., *vid. sup.* p. 273) ἐκβιαζόμενοι, ἄλλος ἄλλαχοῦ διεδίδρασκον. καὶ

τοίνυν αὐτῇ διὰ σοῦ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ἀνεῖται, καὶ σοὶ τροφὸς ἀρίστη καὶ τιθηνὸς γίνεται, and after four lines περιβαλομένῳ. This is a very instructive passage. Comp. *Epist. Jer.* ver. 17 ὥσπερ γὰρ σκεῦος ἀνθρώπου συντριβὲν ἀχρεῖον γίνεται, ver. 18 ὑπὸ τῶν ληστῶν, ver. 24 τὸ γὰρ χρυσίον ὃ περικεῖνται εἰς κάλλος, ἐὰν μὴ τις ἐκμάξῃ τὸν ἰόν, οὐ μὴ στίλψωσιν κ.τ.λ., ver. 12 περιβεβλημένων. In *Appendix A* (p. 344) the use of vv. 11, 12 in Clement's § 12 is suggested. On p. 270 special attention is directed to the coincidences which may be found in Euseb. *De Laud. Const.* vi. with Clement's § 20 and the *Apost. Const.* In the midst of those coincidences we find . . . χρώματι, ὥσπερ τινὰ χρυσοῦφῃ ψήγματα, στίλβειν, and presently ταύτην δ' ἐστίαν καὶ τιθηνὸν καὶ μητέρα ζῶων κ.τ.λ. Comp. with pseudo-Agath. and Nicephorus. Turn now to the coincidence with Clement's § 20, given (p. 262) out of the quotation from Epiphanes in Clem. Alex. Half a dozen lines below that coincidence we remark τροφή τε κοινὴ χαμαὶ νεμομένοις ἀνεῖται πᾶσι κ.τ.λ. Any amount of this kind of interlacing may be shown in the *Dedicatio*, for its Greek is the very same as that of *Peregrinus*, Clement's *Epistles*, etc. Nothing can be more instructive than the comparison of the *Proæmium* in chap. i. with the *Dedicatio*. The first shows Nicephorus' method of dealing with the pages (mainly) of a single author (Diodorus), where it can be studied without difficulty, while the *Dedicatio* shows the same method applied to the pages of various writings.

4. Let us take another example of the same kind. In § 20, in the celebrated passage concerning the "worlds beyond the ocean" (*vid. sup.* p. 261), Clement uses the word διευθύνειν. He uses it also in § 61, and Lightfoot there refers to § 20, and adds "otherwise it is not a common word." Clément writes: . . . ταῖς αὐταῖς ταγαῖς ("an unusual word") τοῦ δεσπότου διευθύνονται, καιροὶ ἑαρινοὶ καὶ θερινοὶ καὶ μετοπωρινοὶ καὶ χειμερινοὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ μεταπαρὰ διδόναι ("a rare word"). This last word we affirmed (p. 270) to be taken from the treatise which we were just now using, Euseb. *De Laud. Const.* vi. The passage (so far as is necessary) is this: χειμερίους (obs.) μὲν ὥρας ἑαρι (obs.) περιγράψας, ἑαρος δ' ἐνιαυσίων ὥρων ἀρχὴν ἰσορρόποις ταλαντεύσας ζυγοῖς· καὶ πάλιν ἑαρος πολυκαρπία τὸν σύμπαντα στεφανώσας αἰῶνα, θέρους (obs.) ἀκμῇ τοῦτον μεταπαρὰ δέδωκεν (obs.), with μετοπωρινῶ (obs.) in the next line.

Didymus (*Expos.* Ps. (LXX.) cxxxviii. 9) is supposed to quote Clement's passage on the "worlds." He reads διαταγαῖς and διιθύνονται, but in the next line he has ταγαῖς (obs.) τῆς ἐαυτοῦ προνοίας διοικούμενα ἰθύνεται. In *Dedic.* p. 13, Nicephorus has a sentence of seven lines: κὰν σοφῇ τινι προνοίᾳ (obs.) Θεὸς . . . ὥσπερ τι βάρος ἀντιταλαντεύσας (obs.) τούτοις πᾶσιν ἰσόρροπον (obs.) . . . διιθύνων (obs.) κ.τ.λ. In the previous sentence Nicephorus has ἡ γὰρ ἂν τοσοῦτον εἰσέρρει στίφος ἐχθρῶν, τὴν ἀκραιφνῇ πίστιν. With the first clause comp. pseudo-Basil quoted on p. 273. Nicephorus has ἀρχηγός two lines above, as pseudo-Basil also has. He describes the emperor presently as another Noah or Moses. Pseudo-Basil has shortly before said that Gregory was a second Moses (*vid. sup.* p. 260). In *Theoph.* 29 we find τῆς ἀκραιφνεστάτου πίστεως only a few lines above the passage quoted from Basil (*vid. sup.* p. 276). A few lines above, Nicephorus describes Demaratus' feelings on seeing Alexander seated upon his throne; and the way in which he writes recalls *Theoph.* 18 and Alexander's vision of Serapis (*vid. sup.* p. 256). Ἀστράπτοντας is there, and συναστράπτοντα is here. An "immortal name" is there, and τὸ μέγα ὄνομα is here. This at once recalls a familiar page in pseudo-Galen (*vid. sup.* p. 91). These things are all on p. 13 in Nicephorus; and on the same page, two lines below διιθύνων, we remark περιρρέόντων (δεινῶν). This calls up *Orat.* 5 κακῶν περιρρέόντων (*vid. sup.* p. 192). In this section is the expression σοφία ἀπαραμιλλήτω (*vid. sup.* p. 177). The last word appears, as is fitting, in Nicephorus in its later form ἀπαράμιλλος. He uses it with γνῶσις (*vid. sup.* p. 177, n. 1) on p. 27, and with σύνεσις on p. 20. A few lines above (p. 20) we observe θεότευκτον (*vid. sup.* p. 179), and half a dozen lines below διευλαβουμένῳ. As we have seen (pp. 176, 179), the *Oratio* uses θεότευκτος in § 1. A few lines below it, in § 2, is διευλαβηθέντα. From the fresh standing ground which this page of Nicephorus affords, it would be easy to call upon the stage almost every one of the writings which have been examined. But it surely is unnecessary. We shall only notice one thing more. We observed just now, on p. 13, ἀντιταλαντεύσας, or as it is in the parallel passage in Eusebius ταλαντεύσας. The word is familiar to us. We will refer, however, to the example of its use, which ought least of all

to bring to light coincidences with Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians. The word is used by Achilles Tatius in his description of the death of Charicles (*vid. sup.* p. 210). We must give the passage: ὁ δὲ κακοδαίμων Χαρικλῆς, ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς ἱππείας ταλαντευόμενος κύματος, ἐκ τῆς ἑδρας ἐσφαιρίζετο, ποτὲ μὲν ἐπ' οὐρανὸν κατολισθαίνων, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τράχηλον κυβιστῶν. ὁ δὲ τοῦ κλύδωνος ἐπείζεν αὐτὸν χειμῶν, τῶν δὲ ῥυτῆρων οὐκέτι κρατεῖν δυνάμενος, δοὺς δὲ ἑαυτόν, ὅμως τῷ τοῦ δρόμου πνεύματι, τῆς τύχης ἦν. ὁ δὲ ἵππος, ῥάμῃ θεῶν ἐκτρέπεται τῆς λεωφόρου κ.τ.λ. In Nicephorus we observe κλύδωνος. A coincidence with Clement's § 20, in the words ἐμποδιζόμενος εἰς τὸν δρόμον, found a few lines below in Tatius, has been pointed out on p. 211. We turn to Eusebius and observe, a few lines above the passage first quoted from *De Laud. Const.* vi., εἰς ἀνάπαυλαν καὶ θυμηδίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν τῆς ζωῆς διυπνεούντων (obs.) δρόμον (obs.). ὥς γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἐπ' ἐλπίδι βραβείων ἐν ἀγῶνι τοὺς δρόμους διεξανύουσι, with ἡ λεωφόρος after one line, and presently διανύουσι. In § 20, Clement has δρόμον διανύουσιν μὴδὲν ἀλλήλοις ἐμποδίζοντα (obs.). In *Apost. Const.* viii. 12, in the fifty lines formerly under our hands (*vid. sup.* p. 268), we find εἰς ἀνάπαυλαν. There also we have ὁ τὴν μεγάλην θάλασσαν χωρίσας (cf. Clement's § 33) τῆς γῆς καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀναδείξας, πλωτήν, . . . τὴν δὲ . . . βοτάναις στεφανώσας καὶ ἄνθεσι καλλύνας . . . καὶ πηγαῖς ἀεννάοις μεθύσας, ὅρεσι δὲ περισφίγξας εἰς ἑδραν ἀτρεμῇ γῆς ἀσφαλεστάτην . . . ἐνιαυτῶν κύκλοις. A little below we observe παντοίων φυτῶν and ἀνῆκας. Half a dozen lines above the passage quoted, Eusebius has πηγὰς ἀεννάους, ἐνιαυτῶν κύκλοι, and as we follow down the column we observe κάλλεσιν ἐστεφάνωσεν, ᾧ καὶ θάλατταν πλωτὴν ἀνῆκε καὶ γῆν παντοίοις φυτοῖς ἐστεφάνωσεν. A few lines below this, Eusebius has the ἰσοῤῥόποις ταλαντεύσας ζυγοῖς before commented upon, the ταλαντεύσας of which is here used. In Achill. Tat. vi. 19, we find . . . ταλαντεύεται. μάχεται δὲ ἄμφω περὶ τῆς ῥοπῆς. with τῆς οἰκείας ἑδρας ἐκπεσόντα half a dozen lines below. There is evidently the closest possible connection between Clement, §§ 20, 33, Tatius, *De Laud. Const.*, the *Apost. Const.*, and Nicephorus. A connection between the *Apost. Const.* and pseudo-Agatharchides in the use of the word περισφίγξας has been pointed out on p. 269. The passage is this: περιθέντες βοὸς οὐρανὸν περὶ τὸν αὐχένα

τῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸν ὀπίσω τοῦ τραχήλου δεσμὸν εὔ μάλα περισφίγγαντες, ἀπολύουσι τοῦ βίου. Comp. now with Tatius. With all this remarkable interlacing, as it were, of these various writings before us, is it possible for one moment to doubt that the ἔδραν ἀσφαλῆστατην of the *Apost. Const.* must be referred to the ἐκ τῆς ἔδρας ἐσφαιρίζετο of Tatius, and the ἐκκρούεται τῆς ἔδρας which follows. In confirmation of this, observe that Clement in § 33 (obs.) has διεκόσμησεν (obs.) αὐτούς· γῆν (obs.) τε διεχώρισεν (ἐχώρισεν (obs.) Damasc.) ἀπὸ τοῦ περιέχοντος αὐτὴν ὕδατος καὶ ἤδρασεν (obs.) ἐπὶ τὸν ἀσφαλῆ (obs.) τοῦ ἰδίου βουλήματος θεμέλιον (obs.). In Leontius and John, the reading is ἔδρασεν (!). In *Dedic.* 9, Nicephorus has διολισθαίνουσι (cf. Tatius) τοῦ τοσοῦτου σάλου, and after two lines καὶ δῆτ' ἔσχε μεγίστην ἔδραν (obs.) τε καὶ ἀσφάλειαν (obs.) εἰς κόσμον (obs.) εἰρήνης ἓνα, καὶ κύκλον (obs.) ὀρθοδοξίας κ.τ.λ. With both Clement and Nicephorus, comp. the words from the *Apost. Const.* ὅρεσι δὲ περισφίγγας εἰς ἔδραν ἀτρεμῇ γῆς ἀσφαλῆστατην· ἐπληρώσας γάρ σου τὸν κόσμον καὶ διεκόσμησας αὐτόν, with ἐνιαυτῶν κύκλοις after two lines.

It seems impossible to come to any other conclusion than that the writings which we have been examining belong all to the same family, if not all to the same author, however diverse soever they may seem to be the one from the other, and that they are jest and parody from the beginning to the end. We have traced them down to the fifteenth century; for though Nicephorus Callistus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, is supposed to have died about the middle of the fourteenth century, yet there is no proof, besides that which is derived from the single ms. which contains the work under his name, that he wrote any ecclesiastical history whatever, and this ms. is of later date. We believe that we have now, not so well as we could wish, yet still sufficiently, redeemed our pledge. We have shown, we think conclusively, the existence of a great literary fraud, and have given good reason for supposing that it was committed in the times of the revival of learning.

CHAPTER VII.

CONCLUSION.

§ 1.

IF in the majority of instances the coincidences which have been produced in the foregoing pages have accidentally arisen, it will be obvious to every thoughtful mind that a very large number of duplicates must have been found, seeing that the coincidences themselves are made up for the most part of words in fairly common use. Our readers are fully able to judge what amount of difficulty has been found in dealing with such duplicates, for we have made it our rule, when comparing two passages together, to give every verbal coincidence which we could detect. It has thus come to pass that a great number of coincidences are given of very trifling importance in themselves, and which owe whatever force they possess simply to the circumstances under which they were found. It must be observed, however, that there was for the most part an exceeding opportuneness in the time when those trifling coincidences came to hand. They were the coincidences which we should expect to find if we really were, as we supposed we were, following upon the track of writers who used ancient authors in the same way as Nicephorus used Diodorus, but with more caution.

We are perfectly well aware that accidental coincidences can be produced ; but we know also that coincidences that can be *proved* to be accidental are far less numerous than some persons perhaps imagine. Coincidences, whether accidental or not, may be found by the laborious process of reading through volume after volume, and comparing the language with that of the writing for which the coincidences are desired. Such coincidences are exceedingly difficult to find, and there is one noticeable peculiarity which always attends them. A coincidence may be found for (say) *Diognet. 2*, the next will be for

§ 5 or § 10, and so on. When a few coincidences have been collected it is impossible to show the connection between them, and to explain how they found their way into the writing which is supposed to have borrowed them. It is true that these may not be accidental, but until you have discovered the method on which the writing in question is composed, you cannot prove that the resemblances have not accidentally arisen. When we entered upon the inquiry, of which this volume is the narrative, it was with the knowledge of the method on which the documents with which we had to deal were composed. We knew certain treatises and certain pages of those treatises to be used by our writer. These pages formed the starting-points of our examination. We then considered whether it was possible to reconstruct any considerable portions of the writing under examination out of the pages in which we thus found ourselves. We put ourselves for the time being into the position of our writer, and tried to imagine what ideas the language of the author we had for the moment in hand would be likely to suggest, and what points would probably be followed up by the examination of other authors. We referred to those authors, but always on some hint previously supplied that a search in such directions would be fruitful. It has thus come to pass that in the foregoing pages not one coincidence is given which was accidentally found. The element of accident or chance is eliminated at any rate from the discovery of the coincidences, and the value of the coincidences found is tested at every step. It thus happens that for every set of coincidences which has been brought before our readers, there is an additional circumstance to be considered, viz. the way in which we were led to the place in which they were found. It is impossible adequately to show on paper the irresistible force which this circumstance gives even to coincidences in themselves very trifling.

Accidental coincidences may, however, be found. If a comparison is made between two writings upon the same subject, *e.g.* "the common places of Christian teaching," there will be found, and "it would be strange if there were not found," at least some "coincidences in insulated words and occasional phrases."¹ And if the various writings which have been examined had been either all of them, or those of them

¹ Alf. *Proleg.* 2 Pet. § iv. p. 148, 1st ed.

which are the most closely connected, upon the same subject, it would be necessary to believe a great many of the coincidences which we have pointed out to be purely accidental. But no two of our writings are upon the same subject, and those of them which upon examination appear to be the most closely connected are just those which are the furthest removed from one another in subject and general tone and character. What can seem more opposite to an epistle expostulating with the Corinthians on their divisions than the love story of Achilles Tatius? yet what can be closer than the connection between these writings at certain points?

Pp. 242,
243, 292.

P. 51.

What community of thought is there between *De Morte Peregrini* and the excerpts from Helladius the grammarian? yet how close is the connection! It will be well to enumerate some of the subjects of the writings whose honesty we have impeached, that their incongruity in character may be clearly seen. We have an account of the life and death of a vain-glorious fool, an apocryphal gospel, hortatory and didactic epistles, a description of these epistles, summaries of grammatical remarks, historical excerpts descriptive of men and manners, accounts of hermaphrodites, a love story, the praise of classical study, prefaces to a volume of extracts from divers authors, and a synodical letter on image-worship. It must be confessed that this is a motley group of writings, and yet the members of this motley group seem to be very closely connected together, not only amongst themselves, but also in the authors which they used in common. It cannot be pretended that the coincidences which have been given in the foregoing pages between the various members of our group of writings are such as must necessarily arise when two or more writers are treating of the same subject.

Now it must be observed that this dissimilarity in subject and character—and yet (oftentimes) similarity in language—and this community in the use of authors is exactly what must be found if our theory is correct, and the writings in question of very late authorship. We argue that their author (or authors) belonged to the times of the revival of learning, that he was a sufficient scholar, a man possessed of a keen relish for jest and parody, and unscrupulous. Such a man would personate an ancient author, not with a polemical end in view,

not with the desire of doing good, but simply for his own amusement, and for the sake of feeling his own literary power, and from his love of that kind of often innocent deceit which finds a pleasure in assuming a character which is not one's own, a pleasure which belongs as much to playgoers as to play-actors, and which is not confined to them. Such a man in carrying out his literary deceptions would not write a number of treatises upon the same subject—there would be little amusement in such repetition,—nor would he write always under the same name. If he did either of these two things, his detection would be certain. He would provoke that very comparison of his treatises which we have just made, and which he would seek by all means to avoid. He would be necessarily, and perhaps unconsciously, a literary Proteus. He would have his favourite authors, which would leave their mark upon almost everything written by him. He would jest upon a passage, but he would not forget his jokes, and would repeat them again and again in altered forms. *Our* literary Proteus may not have been a single individual. The phenomena which have been pointed out in the foregoing pages may as well be ascribed to two or more writers acting in concert, or in perfect knowledge of each other's secrets, as to a single individual. Differences in style would, if necessary, be thus explained. There was some single individual doubtless who led the way, and who to a great extent marked out the methods and laid down the lines on which treatises not actually his own would be composed. Anybody, indeed, possessed of some ability in writing Greek sentences could follow along the road by which we have taken our readers, and could manufacture out of the pages passing under his eye a treatise on any subject "grave or gay." If the writer put his sentences well together, and rigidly adhered to the golden rule of never borrowing too much from any one page or treatise, and if he adapted his language and ideas fairly well to the circumstances surrounding the ancient author whose character he assumed, the treatise would defy detection until some one discovered its method of composition, and compared it with the proper documents. It would remain unsuspected, for it would be compared with writings of like character and subject, and to these it would show no unnatural affinity. But if that writing were once

compared with the foregoing pages and with the passages to which those pages refer, the fraud would be at once apparent. We have shown how the writings with which we have been dealing were put together. If any one is minded to add another of his own composition to the group, he will not find much difficulty in his way. There are still some things in Aristophanes, and in the other authors which have been in our hands, with which a quick wit may make itself merry. However ill such wit may agree with the temper of the scholars of to-day, it was such as Henry Stephens and the scholars of his day thoroughly delighted in (*vid. sup.* p. 16).

§ 2.

The documents whose authenticity has been denied in the foregoing pages are as follows:—

1, *De Morte Peregrini*, ascribed to Lucian; 2, the apocryphal *Evangelium Thomæ*; 3, *Epistolæ duæ ad Corinthios*, bearing the name of Clement, one of which has been commonly supposed to be genuine; 4, Photius' *Bibliotheca*, Cods. 126, 232, 244, 250, 279; 5, *De Prænotione ad Epigenem Liber*, ascribed to Galen; 6, *De Legendis Libris Gentilium*, ascribed to Basil; 7, *De Spiritu Sancto*, cc. xxix. xxx., also ascribed to Basil; 8, *Epistola ad Diognetum*, ascribed to Justin Martyr; 9, *Oratio*, also ascribed to Justin; 10, *Epistola ad Theophilum*, a "synodical letter" found amongst the works of John of Damascus; 11, *Præfationes duæ* to the *Sacra Parallela* of John of Damascus; 12, *Clitophontis et Leucippes Amores*, ascribed to Achilles Tatius; 13, *Maccabæorum* iii.

It is not, of course, maintained that the evidence against the genuineness of these writings is equally conclusive in all cases. Some of these have been only slightly examined. We have plenty of evidence still in hand, if it should be called for. We believe, however, that nothing further is necessary, because there are two points specially to be borne in mind.

(1.) In the first place, the singular way in which all the writings above mentioned are connected together must be considered. We began with *Peregrinus*, and showed that it was not
P. 52. written by Lucian. Then, as treatise after treatise was taken up, we continually found coincidences with *Peregrinus*. The
P. 39. *Evang. Thom.* came upon the scene at an early stage in the inquiry, and was then lost sight of for a long time, but it

appeared again at the close. Achilles Tatius' love story was shown to have something in common with every one of our writings, and was itself shown to have borrowed again and again from the *Bibliotheca*, which describes it, and consequently to be a fraud. Care has been taken to make the evidence the strongest in the case of those writings which are the most strongly supported, *e.g.* Clement's Epistles. The solitary strong point in favour of the antiquity of 3 Macc. is the fact that it is found in the Codex Alexandrinus. This will be no longer a strong point if the evidence adduced suffices to show that Clement's Epistles, which are also in that codex, are of late date. The point to be observed is that all the writings named above are closely connected, that all show signs of unfair dealing, and that the dishonesty of some of them is indisputable.

(2.) In the next place, as we have again and again remarked, the circumstances under which the coincidences produced were found must be remembered. We shall call attention presently to a number of *sets* of coincidences. The individual force of these is very considerable, but in nearly every case the force is immensely increased, and in some cases almost entirely consists in the circumstances under which a particular set was found.

The table of contents prefixed to this volume supplies the means of tracing out the evidence bearing upon the several members of our group of writings. Among those examined there are, however, two of very considerable importance, the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, and Clement's Epistles. The first has the greatest intrinsic value, the second raises the most difficult questions. It will be well, therefore, to give a brief summing up of the principal points in the evidence bearing upon these two. In the course of our remarks nearly all the other writings will necessarily come into view.

§ 3.

The *Myriobiblion seu Bibliotheca* of Photius is unquestionably one of the most extraordinary, and, if its contents can be trusted, one of the most valuable books that was ever written. It has been described as "an extensive review of ancient Greek literature by a scholar of immense erudition and sound

judgment.”¹ A prefatory letter informs us that the work contains the account of 279 volumes or “codices” which Photius had read during his embassy “to the Assyrians” (whatever that may mean), and was written at the request of his brother Tarasius, to whom the letter is addressed. The embassy doubtless was a long one, and the libraries to which Photius had access rich in works which have not come down to us. It is a noticeable circumstance that the excerpts with which we have been concerned in the foregoing pages are, without exception, from works which no longer survive. The writings of Agatharchides, Helladius, Ptolemæus, Stephanus Gobarus, and the books of Diodorus from which the excerpts are made, are lost. This is a very significant fact.

Extraordinary as is the value of the *Bibliotheca*, it somehow or other has not received the attention of *authors* which it deserved. In Migne’s edition (p. 14) are “*Eruditorum aliquot de Photio P. C. judicia.*” Zonaras and Cedrenus are referred to, but neither of these writers mention the *Bibliotheca*. The third name is that of F. Turrianus, who in his *Proëm. Apost. Const.* 1578, several times mentions this work. Earlier notices, no doubt, may be found. H. Stephens, for example, published the excerpts from Agatharchides in 1557, and those from Diodorus in 1559. Gregory of Constantinople, moreover, appears to refer to it. Still the book would not seem to have attracted the attention which might be expected, nor does there seem to be in existence any such notice of it as will identify our present *Bibliotheca* with the work which Photius compiled. There is, indeed, in Suidas, under the head of ‘*Ἡράκλειος*, a considerable passage which is found in Phot. *Bibl.* 242. It is, however, idle to appeal to a book so notoriously interpolated as Suidas’ *Lexicon*. The circumstances, moreover, under which the passage appears in Cod. 242 are such as to excite a suspicion of foul play.

The MSS., however, would seem to have received almost an undue share of the attention of celebrated *scribes*. Bekker describes four MSS. The handwriting of the first, he says, is “*Similis Aristophani Ravennati* ;” of the third, “*Joanni Rhoso* ;” of the fourth, “*Angelo Vergecio*” (*vid. sup.* p. 8). The second MS., he says, is “*non antiquus.*”

¹ Smith, *Dict. Gr. Rom. Biog.*, art. “Photius.”

The *Bibliotheca* has been roundly charged with being interpolated by Küster (in Suidas) and others. We need not detail their reasons. They have not hitherto materially shaken the credit of the volume, and probably would not do so if they were again advanced. It may be stated, however, that Cod. 244 has confessedly received a clumsy, and we believe purposely clumsy, addition. If the volume has been tampered with to a considerable extent, it is obvious that it might be very convenient to have at an immaterial point plain tokens of a very clumsy interpolator. To this person could be referred any considerable mistakes into which the real interpolator might fall.

In the foregoing pages the genuineness of Cods. 126, 232, 244, 250, and 279 has been denied for reasons which we believe to be sufficient.

Chap. vi. is devoted to the examination of cods. 126 and 244; and as these will come before us presently in connection with Clement's Epistles, we may pass them by for the present. P. 313.

The authenticity of Cod. 232 (Stephanus Gobarus) is denied on the ground of its plain connection with Tatius, Clement, Eusebius, and the interpolated Epistles of Ignatius. The "codex" contains short summaries of remarks which must have occupied a considerable space in the original volume, if it ever existed. The coincidences pointed out are not with one of these summaries only, but with a number. The conclusion that the excerpts have been manufactured, appears to be a necessary one.

Cod. 250, which contains the excerpts from Agatharchides, has been much more completely examined. The evidence Pp. 92-107. shows very plainly that these excerpts combine the language of Diodorus and Strabo, and occasionally of Ælian. We need not repeat it. We must add, however, that the conclusions arrived at after a formal examination of the codex is confirmed in later pages by two sets of coincidences, either of which Pp. 236, 274. suffices to prove that the codex does not contain honest excerpts from Agatharchides, and by the peculiar connection which has repeatedly been pointed out between the codex and various members of our group of writings, *e.g.* *Theophilus*, Tatius, Clement, etc., which can only be explained on the P. 221. theory that the codex is a fraud.

Cod. 279 contains summaries of the grammatical remarks of

Helladius. The evidence is very much the same as that which convicts Cod. 232 of dishonesty. The summaries are very brief, while the remarks themselves must have occupied considerable space. The summaries are, however, indebted to
P. 53. Aristophanes and his scholiast. It was not therefore Helladius, but the person who borrows his name, who used Aristophanes. This conclusion is confirmed by coincidences, of a curious
P. 55. nature, with Cyril of Jerusalem, and also by the connection
P. 234. which is shown to exist between two summaries and a single sentence of Achilles Tatius.

The evidence against the integrity of the *Bibliotheca* has, of course, a cumulative force. If the evidence against any one of these codices is conclusive, it must then be considered whether coincidences which in one case certainly arise from fraud must not in other cases be held to arise from the same cause. The fact that we have not even in one instance been brought into contact with excerpts from books which are now in existence, must not be lost sight of. We must hold it to be sufficiently proved that at least five "codices" of the *Bibliotheca*, including the description of Clement's Epistles, are spurious.

It has been shown that H. Stephens published the *Oratio*,
P. 196. a treatise ascribed to Justin Martyr, well knowing it to be spurious. As we have just observed, he also published the spurious excerpts from Agatharchides and Diodorus. He seems to have exercised some strange spell over the *Bibliotheca*. He possessed a MS., and had it in his power to have published it. This he would not do; and it would seem that he was able also to hinder its publication at the hands of others. The *Bibliotheca* was first printed in 1601, some years after Stephens' death.

§ 4.

We pass on to consider how the case stands with respect to Clement's Epistles.

1. We did not originally intend to do more in the present volume than show that the genuineness of these epistles is not so clear and self-evident a matter as is commonly supposed. In the course of the foregoing inquiry, however, the evidence on this point has accumulated to such an extent that we feel sure that we have in hand sufficient not merely to justify us in asking, but also to enable us to answer the question, Are the two

epistles under the name of Clement what they pretend to be? the one the genuine work of Clement of Rome, the other a really ancient writing, though erroneously ascribed to the Roman bishop? So far as we know, this question has not been asked since the discovery of C. and the consequent publication of the epistles in a complete form. The old answer to the question is not now sufficient. The problem to be solved is not in all respects the old one, and a new solution is required.

The meagreness of our information with respect to the past history of the three MSS. of Clement's Epistles is pointed out in the Appendix. This will probably not be thought to be P. 329. any very serious objection, seeing that not a few important MSS. are in the same predicament. Still it is necessary to observe that no argument in favour of the genuineness of these MSS. can be deduced from their past history. The genuineness of the MSS. can only be proved by proving the genuineness of their contents.

It is, of course, at once admitted that there is a mass of evidence which seems at first sight to prove the authenticity of the contents of the MSS., *i.e.* the epistles themselves. Polycarp, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Photius, and others, have in one way or other shown their knowledge of Clement's Epistles—of one or of both. In our epistles are found passages to which these writers may be supposed to refer. The conclusion has seemed necessarily to follow, that our epistles are those which these writers used. The list of such writers has been gradually extended since the publication of the *Editio Princeps* in 1633; and thus the tracing of the supposed acknowledgment of our epistles from author to author, and from century to century, is a very conspicuous feature in all modern editions of Clement. We must not, however, shut our eyes to the fact that evidence of this kind must necessarily be found in our epistles. Whether they are or are not, they at any rate claim to be the two Epistles to the Corinthians by Clement of Rome. The existence of this evidence proves the claim. What further does it *prove*? What forger, desiring to pass off two epistles of his own as the veritable epistles bearing the name of Clement, would omit the references made by antiquity, and content himself with simply writing the title at the head of his MS.? As

well might the utterer of a base coin omit its distinctive marks, and flatter himself that by simply calling it a shilling he would deceive a credulous public. A forger of an ancient writing may possibly err by saying too much, or by saying too little, or by the total omission of some reference which has escaped his researches,—we shall point out presently one or two defects of these kinds found in our epistles,—but it is perfectly certain that he will endeavour to satisfy every reference of antiquity on which he can lay his hands. Until lately it has been impossible to test the value of the evidence of this kind adduced in favour of our epistles. If it was contended that a reference (say) by Irenæus to our 1st Epistle was not fully satisfied, it was obvious to answer that an un-mutilated copy would probably fulfil all requirements. There is no longer any room for this reply. The newly-discovered MSS. have completed both epistles for us. They ought now to satisfy all references and respond to all allusions. The absence of a single letter from the superscription which ought to be on a coin will suffice to prove it a forgery, though the presence of every letter will not be sufficient as a proof of genuineness. We cannot, for very obvious reasons, deal as rigorously in this respect with our epistles as with a coin. Still it is evident that the weight of the argument founded on evidence of this kind passed over to the other side on the completion of our epistles. Previously, the important matter was the *presence* in them of certain quotations, etc.; now, the important point is the *absence* from them of passages which may reasonably be looked for. It must be added, that even if it be possible to explain away or account for such omissions, we shall not then have arrived at a *proof* of the genuineness of our epistles. If every one of the allusions of antiquity to Clement's Epistles could be satisfied out of our documents, this would not do more than raise a strong presumption in their favour.

- P. 332. It is shown, however, in the Appendix, that though we now have these epistles in a complete form, there are still some of the allusions of antiquity unsatisfied. The 1st Epistle
P. 336. does not answer in all respects to the description which Irenæus gives of it. Neither the first nor the second supplies an answer
P. 332. to a reference made by pseudo-Justin. In this last case one editor suggests the existence of a lacuna in the 2d Epistle,

another an alteration in pseudo-Justin's text. These suggestions unmistakeably point out the natural inference to be drawn from the omission. Neither of these suggestions, however, even if they are legitimate, will explain the discrepancy in Irenæus' description, for there is in *Ep.* i. an expression which, if the epistle be genuine, marks it out as the document to which Irenæus refers. Nor are these the only omissions, for the 2d Epistle does not contain a passage which the pseudo-Damascene apparently extracted from it. App.
p. 337.

We remarked just now that the forger of an ancient writing might possibly err, not only by saying too little, but also by saying too much. Clement's *Ep.* i. contains a very remarkable statement concerning S. Paul, which, since 1633 (the date of the *Editio Princeps*), has been supposed to show that the apostle fulfilled his purpose (mentioned in Rom. xv. 24), and travelled to Spain. On this statement antiquity is perfectly silent. Writers, such as Jerome and Cyril of Jerusalem, made use to all appearance of Clement's *Ep.* i., and still never allude to this statement, even when expressly speaking of S. Paul and of the extent of his labours. App.
p. 332.

We do not, of course, say that these facts are in themselves a sufficient reason for summarily dismissing our epistles as mere impositions, but we do say that they fully justify any one who has a real value for truth in casting a suspicious eye over them. They are awkward facts when placed at the end of the train of coincidences in the foregoing pages, which seem to show that our epistles are utterly fraudulent.

2. These coincidences vary very much in value as a matter of course, but it is quite easy to pick out from amongst them some sets or groups, the individual force of which is undeniably great, while their cumulative force would seem to be perfectly irresistible.

(1.) Take, for example, the remarkable fact, that certain lines from Sophocles and Euripides are found almost side by side in Stobæus' *Florilegium*, and that these lines, as the editors of Clement point out, seem to be used in a certain passage in *Ep.* i. On later pages the notion that Clement made use of the *Florilegium*, and even of the *Sermo*, in which the coincidence referred to is found, is confirmed by another set of curious coincidences. P. 25.
P. 168.

(2.) In *Ep.* i. Clement uses the word ὑποδείξ. A very competent authority pronounces it to be "very rare in the positive."

- P. 24. Three examples of the use of the positive have been supplied. All three supply coincidences with Clement. Strangely enough, the first furnishes a special coincidence with S., the second P. 254. with A., and the third with C. The third example is from the scholiast on Aristophanes. Scholia in the immediate neighbourhood *seem* to have been used in Clement's *Ep.* ii.

(3.) A remarkable set of coincidences between Clement's Pp. 23, *Ep.* i. 12 and Diodorus has been pointed out. The writer of 342. *Peregrinus*, pseudo-Galen, and Tatius seem to use the same P. 88. pages and sentences. Another set of very remarkable coincidences between Clement and Diodorus has also been pointed P. 263 sq. out. It is incredible that two such groups—not to speak of single coincidences—have accidentally arisen. Their nature shows conclusively that Clement used Diodorus in jest, and therefore was not the Roman bishop.

- (4.) Special attention has been directed in chap. vi. to two passages, the one in Clement's *Ep.* i., treating of repentance, P. 132. the other in *Epistola ad Diognetum*, treating mainly of man's free-will. These passages,—which we shall call C. and D.,—upon comparison, show no coincidences the one with the other. They appear, however, to use the same portions of the LXX. We find, moreover, in the *Sacra Parallela* of John of Damascus a short sentence, seemingly a translation from the Latin of Pp. 131, Irenæus, one-half of which is closely represented in D., while 167. an expression out of the other half occurs in C. On examination of other passages apparently used in D., we find a passage from Hippolytus and two from Clement of Alexandria which supply coincidences also with C. One of the passages (on free-will) from Clement of Alexandria is contained in P. 134. the *Sacra Parallela* under the head of "Free-will." We P. 134. naturally turn to the *Parallela*, and we observe there a verse of Holy Scripture on repentance (cited in C.) so altered by a certain Eusebius as to give very nearly some words of Clem. Alex. on free-will which stand close by. This seems to give the connecting link between the subject of C. and that of D. Taking this as an indication that our Clement consulted John of Damascus, we turn in the *Parallela* to the P. 136. head of "Repentance." We there find two passages from

Clement of Alexandria separated in Clem. Alex. by only a few lines. These few lines contain a remarkable quotation cited by the editors of Clement, as in great part identical with P. 137. a so-called apocryphal quotation which occurs in C. Further examination seems to show that Clement's so-called apocryphal P. 138. quotation is only a manufacture by himself out of Clem. P. 356. Alex. and Holy Scripture. It has to be considered whether all these things are accidental; for if they are not, it must be conceded that our Clement made use of his Alexandrian namesake and of John of Damascus, and that *Ep. i.* is very closely connected with *Diognetus*.

(5.) It has been shown that a quotation founded on Holy P. 221. Scripture, but possibly derived from some apocryphal source, occurs in our Clement's *Ep. i.*, and also in Clement of Alexandria. In this quotation, as given by Clem. Alex., a word is found which is used by our Clement just outside the quotation. From this coincidence critics with one consent argue that the two Clements are not independent of one another in their use of the quotation in question. We have pointed out, however, that this same word occurs again a little further on in our Clement, and then in the midst of language which carries us back to an earlier part of *Ep. i.*, where the same language is found in connection with a certain verse of Holy Scripture, which our Clement, moreover, seems to glance at in the neighbourhood of the passage first referred to. This verse Clement of Alexandria cites immediately after the apocryphal quotation. The presence of some other curious coincidences between the two Clements at that exact spot have also been P. 221. pointed out, coincidences which by no means look like honest work such as is to be expected from Clem. Alex., but which seem rather to indicate the hand of a man playing upon and trifling with the language of Clement of Alexandria. From these coincidences it seems, indeed, necessary to believe that one or other of the two Clements is dishonest. Which of them is the literary rogue? One answer to this question alone seems possible. If this were the only set of coincidences of like character to be found in our Clement we should hardly hesitate. But we have already had several such sets before us, and have seen reason to conclude from them that Clement was a jesting copyist, and a copyist, moreover, of Clement of Alex- Pp. 71, 122.

andria. We have no need, however, to rely only on what has already been observed, for here in the very place of Clement now in our hands a second set of coincidences has been shown, a set with the excerpts from Agatharchides of the same character as that between the two Clements, and in which the very quotation above referred to is implicated. The dilemma is an interesting one. We must either argue that both Clement of Alexandria and the excerptor of Agatharchides amused themselves with our Clement's language,—which seems incredible,—or else that our Clement borrowed from Clem. Alex. and from the excerpts, unless, indeed, he wrote them. The idea that our Clement, and not his Alexandrian namesake, was the borrower, is confirmed on later pages. We may, indeed, cut the knot by imputing everything to accident. If we do, we necessarily set aside the coincidence which critics, having no fear of consequences before their eyes, have already pronounced trustworthy. Such reversal of judgment would be far more disastrous than the loss of many such epistles as those which bear the name of Clement.

(6.) Along with the *Epist. ad Diognet.*, to which we were just now referring, H. Stephens published the *Oratio ad Græcos*. It has been shown that Stephens annotated and published this treatise well knowing it to be spurious. His notes are specially mixed up with the coincidences between the *Oratio* and Euripides. It has been also shown that these very coincidences are coincidences also with Clement's *Ep. i.* Euripides uses words which naturally suggest a certain verse of Holy Scripture. That verse is used by Clement in the same place. The coincidences altogether at this point are among the most curious which we have produced.

(7.) In the course of the examination of the *Oratio* we came upon a passage in Eustathius' scholia on Dion. *De Sit. Orb.*, and then upon a parallel passage in Hippolytus' *Refutatio*. In Hippolytus we find some coincidences, first with Clement's *Ep. i.* 44, then with *Ep. i.* 33 and *ii.* 14. Hippolytus copies from Herodotus, and in Herodotus some coincidences are found with Clement's *Ep. ii.* Both Hippolytus and Clement use the text 1 Cor. *ii.* 9. The text is a noteworthy one, from the remarks upon it by Hegesippus, quoted by Stephanus Gobarus in Phot. *Bibl.* 232. Coincidences are found between Cod. 232

and all the passages in which Clement uses 1 Cor. ii. 9. A noticeable expression in Cod. 232, shown to be derived from P. 244. Eusebius' account of the Epistles of Ignatius, occurs in a passage in which Achilles Tatius appears to parody 1 Cor. ii. 9. Here again coincidences are found with Clement, and a very remarkable connection in the use which both writers make of Jas. iv. 6. P. 242.

In the course of the examination of Achilles Tatius' love story, many other coincidences with both of Clement's Epistles have been observed, both writers applying themselves to the same pages of other authors, and occasionally to the same sentences. At the close of the inquiry, Clement and Achilles Tatius were found to be very intimately connected with the *Apost. Const.*, Eusebius' *De Laud. Const.*, and Nicephorus. *E.g.* pp. 209, 211, 212, 218.

(8.) It is almost impossible to express in a few words the singular relation of Clement's Epistles to *Peregrinus*.

(α) The writer of *Peregrinus* appears to make use of certain lines of Aristophanes. Comparison with Clement's *Ep.* i. shows that the connection of these lines with the epistle is so close that they read as if they were a parody upon Clement's language. It appears also that the scholia upon those lines were used by Clement in both epistles. P. 47. P. 253. P. 254.

(β) The connection between *Peregrinus* and the description of Clement's Epistles in Phot. *Bibl.* 126 is exceedingly close. P. 250.

1. Pseudo-Photius (Cod. 126 has been shown to be spurious) complains of the use which Clement makes of the fabulous account of the phœnix. The writer of *Peregrinus* speaks of this bird, so also does Achilles Tatius. Coincidences between them are shown, and those coincidences are coincidences also with Clement. The author of *Peregrinus* goes on to give some Sibylline verses which appear to be in some sort a parody upon certain Sibylline verses found in the *Apost. Const.* in company with the account of the phœnix. On the testimony of pseudo-Justin, Clement's *Ep.* i. ought to contain some Sibylline verses—the same now found in the *Apost. Const.* It is pointed out in the Appendix that almost directly after Clement's account of the phœnix there are certain coincidences with 2 Pet., which seem to show that the Sibylline verses once stood in that part of the epistle, or at least that the question was at one time under consideration. App. p. 333. P. 249. P. 226. P. 226 n. P. 334.

2. Pseudo-Photius also complains of Clement's use of the word *προσπάτης*. The circumstances attending the use of this word by our writer or writers are so curious that it is impossible not to suppose that the word was used in jest. It is found in *Peregrinus* in the passage to which we just now referred as indebted to certain lines of Aristophanes. This passage shows coincidences with pseudo-Photius in Cod. 126, and with pseudo-Helladius in Cod. 279, who in the same place also uses the lines of Aristophanes. Pseudo-Lucian, pseudo-Helladius, and Clement seem, all of them, to be indebted to Cyril of Jerusalem, who uses the word in question. Cyril speaks of "the keys." His language is taken hold of by pseudo-Helladius grammatically, as becomes a grammarian. It seems to have given rise also to Clement's use of "the keys," which cannot be thought to be anything else than jesting. Pseudo-Galen and Tatius take up the joke.

- The author of *Peregrinus* in his use of the word appears to be indebted to certain other lines of Aristophanes. These lines show coincidences with Clement in his use of the word, also with *Theophilus*, where again the word is found, and with it coincidences with Clement.

- There are a great number of places scattered up and down the foregoing pages where Clement's Epistles and *Peregrinus* come in contact with one another. It must, however, be enough to add that those pages of Diodorus which have been shown above to have been used by Clement show coincidences with *Peregrinus* as well as with pseudo-Galen and Tatius.

- (9.) The coincidences, however, between Clement's Epistles and the *Epist. ad Theoph.* are perhaps more curious than any others which have been pointed out. The connection between these writings is as close as it is curious. They are related to one another not only directly in the language and ideas which they have in common, but also indirectly through Aristophanes, Eusebius, Tatius, *Diognetus*, etc.

- (1.) Attention was first of all directed to the combination of two passages of Scripture by Clement in *Ep. i. 27*, and by the writer of *Theophilus* in § 31. A passage from *Diognetus* was then in hand containing parallels both with Clement and *Theophilus*. The same place of *Theophilus* with its immediate neighbourhood furnishes coincidences with Clement's *Ep. i.*

§§ 40, 41, 42, 43. This last section contains Clement's jest- P. 118 sq.
ing upon "the keys," and it appears that both writers, if there
were two, made use of the *Oratio Manassis*. P. 120.

(2.) We pointed out that there were a good many indica-
tions that Clement's *Ep. i.*, the closing chapters of *Diognetus*, P. 115 sq.
and *Theophilus* were jestingly intended to set forth three
stages of doctrinal development, and specially so in the case of
χάρις. At a later stage in the inquiry this notion was con-
firmed by the use made of *χάρις* by Tatius in a passage which Pp. 217,
was shown to be very closely connected with Clement. 243.
We found this word used in *Theophilus* in a passage which P. 122.
appeared to be indebted to a quotation from the Roman
Clement found in Jerome, *Comment. Isa.* lii. Our Clement
uses the words, of which Jerome gives the Latin, in *Ep. i.*
They form the preface to *Isa.* liii. We consulted Jerome's P. 123 sq.
Commentary and also Eusebius, and found that both *Ep. i.* and
Theophilus appeared to be indebted to these writers.

(3.) It was afterwards shown that *Theophilus* as well as P. 267.
Clement's *Ep. i.* has its liturgical section, and that both docu-
ments appear to be indebted to the same liturgy. In corro-
boration of the theory that *Theophilus* is nothing but a satirical Do.
and jesting application of the special points of Clement's *Ep. i.*,
it has been pointed out that the language of the liturgies is
addressed to the emperor.

(4.) It has been also remarked that the word *προστάτης*
is used in *Theophilus*, and that for the use of it the writer
appears to have had Aristophanes in his hands, or very dis- P. 251.
tinctly in his mind. The passage in which it is found tells us P. 256.
of a vision of Serapis vouchsafed to Alexander, and is alto-
gether very remarkable. The writer seems to parody Clement's
ideas in *Ep. i.*, and to seek to justify pseudo-Photius' complaint P. 249.
of the use of the word *προστάτης*. At this point we find that
Clement (in the passage referred to) and Tatius meet together, P. 258.
as it were, in a certain sentence found in Plutarch. Curiously
enough, Tatius' use of Plutarch occurs in a passage which Do.
describes Alexandria illuminated in honour of Serapis. Coin-
cidences with *Theophilus* are there found. Particular notice
should be taken of a curious version which Clement gives here
of a verse in the Psalms, and which is taken up by *Theophilus*. P. 257.
The jest, for it is nothing else, is as much Clement's as Theo-

philus'. The same passage of Clement is, moreover, shown
 P. 255. to be connected with the *Evang. Thom.* in a passage which
 supplies coincidences with the vision of Serapis found in
 P. 257. *Theophilus*. The connection of these writings one with another
 is very remarkable.

(5.) We shall notice only one more set of coincidences.
 The close of *Theophilus*, which has been just now spoken of as
 being so closely related to Clement's *Ep. i.*, contains a passage
 P. 276. from Basil's *De Spir. Sanct.* It has been shown that that
 passage is imitated by pseudo-Basil in the spurious addition to
 P. 270. Basil's treatise. An intimate connection between that addi-
 tion and Clement has been pointed out by us.

Though we have called our readers' attention to nothing
 like all the noticeable groups of coincidences which have been
 furnished in the course of the foregoing inquiry, we have
 nevertheless now pointed out no less than nine such groups,
 each of which contains group within group, and all of which
 are immensely strengthened by the circumstances which sur-
 round them. How are they to be explained? Our contention
 is that Clement's Epistles and the writings which show such
 singular affinity to them are written virtually by the same
 person. It would be absurd to speak of accident with such a
 multitude, not of single coincidences, but of groups of coinci-
 dences before us. No other theory but some such as that
 which we have propounded will satisfy all the conditions of
 the problem. When each of these sets of coincidences is
 examined as it stands in the foregoing pages, and the way in
 which they were severally found is considered, and when
 account is taken of their cumulative force, it must be conceded
 that Clement's Epistles are nothing else than frauds of a late
 date.

3. Another, and in some respects perhaps the most damaging
 part of the evidence against the authenticity of our epistles
 P. 303. has still to be considered. The editors of Clement supply a
 very imposing array of writers who have quoted, described, or
 in some way referred to Clement's Epistles. It is shown, how-
 P. 332. ever, in the *Appendix*, that *all* the references to Clement's
 Epistles are not satisfied in those epistles which are now in our
 hands under Clement's name. This has been remarked upon
 above, and it is not necessary to say anything further upon it.

We must now, however, remind our readers that Dionysius of Corinth (in Eusebius) mentions and to a certain degree describes Clement's *Ep. i.*, and that coincidences have been given which seem to show that the writer of *Ep. i.* made use of Dionysius, or rather of Eusebius. Good reasons have also been advanced above for concluding that the language of the Alexandrian Clement, who quotes his Roman namesake again and again, has been copied into our epistle and not out of it. If this conclusion is a just one, then the principal testimony to the genuineness of our epistle is very effectually disposed of.

From Clement of Alexandria we turn to Basil, who in *De Spir. Sanct.* c. xxix. quotes some words of Clement of Rome which are found in our *Ep. i.* 58. Basil speaks of doxologies, and we find here in c. xxix., in the mouth of Africanus, Clement's "favourite doxology," and which he uses in *Ep. i.* 20. Certain expressions of which Basil makes use guide us to a particular page in Philo where, along with those expressions, we find coincidences again with our *Ep. i.* 20, which cannot be thought to have accidentally arisen. It is obvious to infer that the writer of *Ep. i.* made use of Basil,—if, that is, Basil was really the author of *De Spir. Sanct.* c. xxix.,—and copied into it Basil's quotation from the Roman Clement. This seemingly necessary inference confirms and is confirmed by what has been already observed as to the use made by our writer of Eusebius (Dionysius of Corinth) and Clement of Alexandria.

Photius now comes upon the scene. In his Cod. 126 he gives a description of Clement's Epistles, which is an accurate description of those now in our hands. He complains of various matters found in them, but is careful to add that Clement does not openly blaspheme. The way in which he writes suggests that some ironical meaning lies behind. We know the *Bibliotheca* to have been interpolated, and the suspicion arises that Cod. 126 was not written by Photius. The writer of this "codex" complains, among other things, of Clement's use of apocryphal quotations. Two of these quotations have been examined, and shown to be of Clement's own manufacture. Clement's use of the word *προσπάτης* forms another ground of complaint in Cod. 126. The word is used in *Peregrinus*, with which Cod. 126 is found on examination to be

very closely connected. It is used also in *De Spir. Sanct.* c. xxix., and between this chapter and Cod. 126 a connection has been pointed out which we have no right to expect. In the page of Philo to which Basil's language guides us, as has been just remarked, we find a singular coincidence with certain words found in our *Ep.* i. 20, and of which again Cod. 126 complains.

The relations one to another of our epistles, Cod. 126, and *De Spir. Sanct.* c. xxix., are most unnatural on the supposition that we have to do with three independent writers. What is the explanation? Erasmus comes to the rescue. He long ago expressed his belief that Basil did not write the concluding chapters of *De Spir. Sanct.* We have not concerned ourselves with Erasmus' reasons, which Casaubon is supposed to have adequately answered; but we have examined the language of *De Spir. Sanct.* cc. xxix. xxx., and have found convincing proof that Basil did not write these chapters, but that they are the work of a far later hand. When this fresh light is cast upon the singular relations subsisting between these chapters and Cod. 126, and between these chapters and our epistles, the conclusion seems irresistible that we have to do not with three independent writers, but virtually with one, that is to say, either with one or with three acting in concert.

It must be observed that the singular and damaging facts of which we have been latterly speaking have come to light simply through the cross-examination, so to say, of some of the witnesses for the defence. We have brought them forward, not as the principal proof in the argument that our epistles were not written by Clement,—though this we might have done,—but to support the conclusions to which we are driven by the cumulative force of the various sets of coincidences to which attention has specially been directed. Our epistles are not those epistles which were of old ascribed—the one rightly, the other wrongly—to Clement of Rome, but of far later date. If this is admitted, everything is at once explained. They belong to our “group of writings,” and, as a matter of course, betray their connection with *Peregrinus*, *Theophilus*, *Tatius*' love story, and the other members of the group. We have to do with a literary Proteus, who at one time derides the vainglorious *Peregrinus*, at another portrays primitive purity in faith

P. 260.
P. 270.

P. 261.

P. 259.

P. 271 sq.

P. 277 sq.

(or perhaps in mode of living), or lashes with his satire the extravagant developments of later times. Again, like the chameleon, which adapts itself to the colour of the ground on which it finds itself, as the interpolator of Photius' *Bibliotheca* he gives excerpts from history ecclesiastical or secular, and fictitious accounts of documents which were never written, or true accounts of writings of which he was himself the author. Wearied of these shapes, he assumes the form, it may be, of a medical treatise, or laughs at us in an indecent love story. We have shown above that the *Oratio*, printed by H. Stephens in 1592, is one of the members of the "group," and that it was published by him with the full knowledge of its spurious character. We know him to have been equally well aware of the true character of the equally spurious *Epistola ad Diognetum*, the companion of the *Oratio*. * An interesting light is thus thrown upon his reference to Proteus in connection with P. 17. his own parodies.

§ 5.

We have still to inquire to what period the frauds which have been pointed out must be assigned. The character of the various documents whose authenticity has been impugned appears to us to give no uncertain answer to this inquiry. They might have been written in the times of the revival of learning. It is difficult to imagine any other period in which they could have been written. They are literary not polemical frauds, and therefore, as has been shown above, such as we might expect in P. days when the keen pursuit of classical learning had but too little of any real principle to restrain and guide it. Our evidence, however, would seem to be very clear upon this point.

The addition to Basil's *De Spir. Sanct.* was made by the P. 279. author of the *Dedicatio* and *Proæmium* to Nicephorus' *Ecclesiastical History*. He was also guilty of writing the excerpts from Diodorus, and of interpolating them into Photius' *Bibliotheca*. P. 287. On both these points we believe the evidence as nearly to approach a demonstration as can reasonably be expected. But reasons have been given for supposing that the author of the addition to Basil's treatise was also the author of Phot. *Bibl.* Pp. 270-279. 126, and, though he may not have been alone in the work, of Clement's Epistles and the other members of our group of

writings. If this be so, then Nicephorus is the literary Proteus of whom we are in search. The evidence afforded by his own writings that this is actually the case seems to us perfectly
 P. 288 sq. decisive. We have given no more than seems to us to be necessary, but it might be almost indefinitely increased.

Now it must be observed that in Nicephorus we have exactly the person we require. We want a man of scholarly attainments, yet still a man who was content to make up his sentences out of ancient authors, and to lean upon them even for the commonest words and expressions. Nicephorus has gained for himself the name of *Thucydides Ecclesiasticus*, and yet it cannot be denied that his *Proœmium*, starting with an imitation of Thucydides, is made up most carefully out of the language of Diodorus. We want, too, a man capable of writing the most arrant nonsense. Nicephorus is known also by the name of *Theologorum Plinius*. We want a man well acquainted with all that Eusebius and other ecclesiastical writers have written on certain subjects, such as Clement of Rome. Nicephorus wrote an ecclesiastical history, taking his materials from Eusebius, Theodoretus, and others. We want a man to whom the idea of literary fraud, and the passing off of writings as something other than they really are is familiar, and who therefore makes provision that his own work shall be able in all time to come to maintain its identity. In *H. E.* i. 43, Nicephorus speaks of it as a common thing for persons to try to pass off the writings of another as if they were their own,—a fraud the very opposite of, yet still near akin to, that which we have been exposing. To make his own work sure, he begins, he tells us, each one of the eighteen books into which it is distributed with a letter of his own name. Nicephorus was thus, it seems, fond of his little joke. We can conceive it possible that a man of his ingenious turn of mind might hit upon the device of establishing the credit of (say) Clement's Epistles by a mock quotation in Basil. It would be hardly possible, indeed, to find a man more eminently fitted for our literary Proteus than the person who takes such pains to identify himself with Nicephorus Callistus, sometime patriarch of Constantinople, but of whom almost nothing is known beyond what the *History* itself acquaints us with. This work is found in one MS. only, which is not the original one, if the work was really written by Cal-

listus. It is said to have been at one time in the library of M. Corvinus, and on the capture of Buda by the Turks, to have P. 9. been taken to Constantinople, and to have been conveyed thence by "a certain Christian man," and by him sold to the library at Vienna. This is possible enough, for Corvinus had scribes constantly at work, both at Florence and Buda, and he eagerly bought up all Greek MSS. which came in his way. P. 9 n.

We have thus traced the literary fraud which we have been exposing down to the times of the revival of learning. It has been already shown that such frauds were the natural outcome P. 3. of the spirit in which the study of classical learning was then pursued, and that frauds of this kind—not always of small Pp. 5, 6. dimensions—were actually attempted. It has also been shown that men of dishonest minds turned their attention to Diodorus P. 6. Siculus, a fact which accords well with the extraordinary interest which, in the case of every member of our "group of P. 306. writings," the author seems to take in Diodorus. Another fact which concerns the period of which we are speaking must be noticed. In the year 1470 (not earlier, though possibly somewhat later) a Syriac MS.¹ was written which claims quasi-canonical authority for two epistles on Virginity, bearing the name of Clement, but which are not found in any other MS., and which are not mentioned in any ecclesiastical catalogue. These epistles follow,² in the MS., the Philoxenian version of the epistle of S. Jude. The Syriac MS. (S.), which contains Clement's two epistles to the Corinthians, gives the Philoxenian version of the N. T., and places these epistles after S. Jude. Both MSS. loudly proclaim the date to which they ought to be assigned—the one to the year 1170, the other to the year 1470. It is interesting to see the likemindedness³ of

¹ Purchased at Aleppo for Wetstein, who published the epistles in 1752.

² Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxx. 15, p. 139) speaks of "encyclical letters," in which Clement "teaches virginity;" but as he says that these letters were "read in the holy churches," it is probable that he has in his mind those letters to which Eusebius and Jerome refer, of the contents of which we are ignorant if the epistles to the Corinthians now in our hands are frauds. The language of Epiphanius may, however, be thought to give a reason for the position which the scribe of 1470 assigns to the epistles on Virginity in his MS.

³ Speaking of these unknown and spurious epistles on Virginity, the writer of the article on *Clemens Romanus* in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (Smith and Wace) says: "After the epistle to the Hebrews, the last in the Peshito Canon, the scribe adds a doxology, and a note with personal details ('A

these two scribes, separated from one another, as it seems, by the exact term of 300 years, and to observe that the claim of canonical authority for the epistles on Virginity, which, whether ancient or not, were certainly never written by Clement of Rome, was made (apparently for the first time) at the very period when a claim of the same nature was being made for the epistles to the Corinthians, which we have found good reason to believe to be spurious. There may be nothing in the coincidence: it is at any rate worth noticing.

§ 6.

It must not be supposed from our previous silence that we are insensible to the difficulties which lie in the way of accepting the conclusions to which we ourselves have felt obliged to come. We are well aware that the contents of the "codices," in which the three MSS. of Clement's Epistles are found, raise questions which do not allow of an off-hand solution. We are, however, persuaded that if these difficulties were tenfold greater than they really are, they could not even then in any sort equal the difficulty of supposing that the coincidences which have been produced have accidentally arisen. No theory except that of "accident," or some such theory as we have advanced, will explain them. These coincidences are facts which *must* be explained. It is a fact, too, that by some means or other we have contrived, out of the immense number of Greek treatises in existence, to select a few, and upon the coincidences found in these few treatises, to build long account of himself, and the circumstances under which the MS. was written,' Light. p. 15) by which we are enabled to date the MS. A.D. 1470, and then proceeds 'We subjoin to the epistles of Paul those epistles of the apostles which are not found in all the copies,' on which follow 2 Peter, 2, 3 John, and Jude (obs.), from the Philoxenian (obs.) version; and then, without any break (obs.), these letters, with the titles: 'The first epistle of the blessed Clement, the disciple of Peter the apostle,' and 'the second epistle of the same Clement.' In his description of the contents of S., which contains the whole of the Philoxenian version, Lightfoot (p. 233) says: "The Catholic Epistles are followed immediately on the same page by the Epistles of Clement, the epistle of S. Jude with its colophon ending one column, and the First Epistle of Clement beginning the next. This latter is headed: *The Catholic Epistle of Clement the disciple of Peter the Apostle to the Church of the Corinthians*. At the close is written: *Here endeth*, etc. Then follows: *Of the same, the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*." This MS. as loudly protests that it was written in the year 1170 as the first MS. does that it was written in 1470.

up an elaborate, and, we venture to think, consistent theory of literary fraud at a certain period. Will ingenuity, and diligence aided by accident, explain the accomplishment of this stupendous feat? for stupendous it is, if such are the means by which it has been achieved. Ours was, however, a simpler task. The treatises and coincidences were found without much difficulty, when once the method was mastered upon which the treatises, the authenticity of which we have denied, were composed. The facts which we have brought to light will justify the charge of fraud against these treatises, and especially against Clement's Epistles. What evidence can be brought forward in refutation of the charge? Not the difficulties at which we have hinted, for they arise for the most part from our ignorance. Not the circumstance that a great many references by the ancients to Clement's Epistles are verified in *ours*, for if ours are forgeries this will equally be the case. Not the weight of external testimony to the antiquity of our MSS., for there is none. Not the fact that these MSS. have every appearance of belonging to the dates to which they are respectively assigned, for this follows necessarily if such was the forger's intention and if he had the skill to carry out that intention. It cannot be maintained that a successful forgery of a MS. was impossible in times when the transcription of MSS. was an everyday occupation, and imitative writing one of the fine arts. The interpolation once so common must have necessitated in very many cases the production of MSS. apparently older than they really were. Constantine Simonides has taught us that a successful forgery of MSS. is hardly impossible even in this 19th century. He forged, and for a while deceived. It is very instructive to turn to the records, which are preserved, of his case (see *the Report of the Council of the Royal Society of Literature on some of the Mayer Papyri and the Palimpsest MS. of Uranius, belonging to M. Simonides*, London 1863). He failed to satisfy the court of inquiry which sat upon his MSS.; but then its suspicions had been thoroughly aroused by the man's own conduct. He lived, moreover, in the 19th century, when the preparation of MSS. was a long-forgotten trade. He, nevertheless, nearly succeeded. Suppose he had kept his MSS. for some years longer in his own possession, arti-

ficially hastening those processes of nature by which the marks of age are naturally produced, and the tell-tale tokens of recent handiwork are obliterated, and then had caused them to be deposited in a library not too often explored, to be one day accidentally discovered dusty and time-worn. Is there no possibility that they would have been unsuspectingly received, and accepted as genuine? There would have been then no alteration of a MS. which had been previously inspected, an awkward fact that alone, it seems, prevented the volumes of Simonides from adorning the shelves of at least one library. If Simonides had shown a little more scholarship in the use of words, a little more common sense in the "lining" of his MSS., a little more caution in the manipulation of them after they had been inspected, a little more craft in bringing them into notice, he would have succeeded, it may be, in his evil work. It would be easy to point out several persons in earlier times who far surpassed Simonides in the qualities essential to a successful forger, and whose facilities for perpetrating the fraud exposed in the foregoing pages were unrivalled. It has been shown that Henry Stephens knew of this fraud, and lent himself to it right willingly. He was an accessory after the fact certainly, possibly one of the principals; but we must look to somewhat earlier times than those of Henry Stephens for the person who took the initiative.

APPENDIX.

N O T E.

It was originally proposed to publish an examination of the *Epistle to Diognetus*, followed in the same volume by an examination of the *Two Epistles to the Corinthians* bearing the name of Clement of Rome. The introduction and some portions of the investigations relating to the *Two Epistles* were, for certain reasons, put in type in a tentative form. Part of this introductory matter, and the whole of these portions of the investigations, are now printed as an Appendix. It is thought that it may be of some interest to see to what extent later discoveries (the interpolations in Photius' *Bibliotheca*, the dishonesty of *Peregrinus*, Tatius' love story, Galen's treatise, etc.) have confirmed, modified, or refuted earlier conclusions.

All new matter is printed in small type, and enclosed in brackets.

The marginal references are to the foregoing pages.

APPENDIX.

§ 1.

THE two epistles which bear the name of Clement of Rome, and which we propose to examine, are so well known, that the briefest possible account of their history will here suffice.

1. These epistles are now found in three MSS., of which two are in Greek and one in Syriac.

(1.) They were first printed in 1633, by P. Young, out of the Codex Alexandrinus. This celebrated codex was sent, in 1628, to Charles I. by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, and takes its name from Alexandria, where Cyril had previously been patriarch, and from which city, as is supposed, he brought it. This MS. does not give our epistles in a complete form; for of the 1st Epistle (consisting of sixty-five sections) the last sentence of § 57 and the whole of §§ 58–63 inclusive are wanting; while the 2d Epistle (of twenty sections) breaks off in § 12 in the middle of a sentence. This MS. is ascribed to the 5th century, and we shall refer to it by the letter A.

(2.) In 1875, Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Serræ, published Clement's Epistles out of a MS. discovered in the library of the Most Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople. Both epistles are here found in a complete form. This MS., which we shall call C., claims to be of the 11th century.

(3.) The Syriac MS., which we shall call S., professes to be of the 12th century, and, like the preceding, contains our epistles in a complete form. It was purchased at Paris for the Cambridge University Library,—soon after the publication of C.,—out of a collection of MSS. formerly belonging to M. Jules

Mohl. Whenever we shall have occasion to refer to this MS., our reference will be to Canon Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome*, Appendix, 1877. This MS. claims canonical authority for our epistles, and divides them into lessons for public reading.

2. The editions and considerable notices of our epistles are too numerous to mention. The editions of P. Young in 1633, and of Bryennios in 1875, have an interest peculiarly their own. Of the rest, the edition of Canon Lightfoot in 1869—followed in 1877 by an appendix volume, containing the newly discovered portions of both epistles, and the various readings of the Syriac MS.—is by far the most complete and suggestive; and on this account we shall make considerable use of it in the course of our inquiry. The two volumes of this edition are intended to form one book, and the paging is consecutive throughout. The appendix volume begins with p. 223.

§ 2.

Canon Lightfoot has made a most elaborate analysis and comparison of the various readings of the three MSS. It will be well to notice some of the inferences which he draws:—

“(1.) In A. C. S. we have three distinct authorities for the text. Each has its characteristic errors, and each preserves the genuine text in some passages, where the other two are corrupt.

“(2.) The stream must be traced back to a very remote antiquity before we arrive at the common progenitor of our three authorities. This follows from their mutual relations.

“(7.) Looking at the dates and relations of our authorities, we may be tolerably sure that, when we have reached their archetype, we have arrived at a text which dates not later, or not much later, than the close of the 2d century. On the other hand, it can hardly have been much earlier. For the phenomena of the text are the same in both epistles; and it follows therefore, that in this archetypal MS. the so-called 2d Epistle must have been already attached to the genuine Epistle of Clement, though not necessarily ascribed to him.

“(8.) But, though thus early, it does not follow that this text was in all points correct. Some errors may have crept in already and existed in this archetype, though these would probably not be numerous.—And it would seem also that this text had already undergone slight mutilations.”—*Lightfoot*, p. 244 sq.

The argument is then this: Our earliest MS. carries us back, indeed, to the 5th century; but the comparison of the three

MSS. leads us to postulate an archetypal MS. written at the close of the 2d century, in which the textual errors would be neither numerous nor considerable. The combined evidence of the MSS. carries us, in short, very nearly to Clement's own times.

It does not appear quite obvious why the phenomena, which the comparison of the three texts reveals, should set us down exactly at the close of the 2d century. Lightfoot was no doubt guided in his opinion by the date (A.D. 120-140) which he gives for the authorship of the 2d Epistle. Hilgenfeld, who believes Clement of Alexandria to have written this 2d Epistle, must necessarily place the archetype considerably later. We do not, however, dispute the soundness of Canon Lightfoot's main position. We admit, and are prepared to argue, that the three MSS. are apparently three distinct witnesses to the existence of an archetypal MS., the date of which has not yet been accurately determined. We entirely believe that such a MS. did at one time exist. But we do not admit that this fact *proves* the genuineness of our epistles; for if these epistles were either early or late frauds, the same phenomena would be found, on comparison of our three MSS., which are now found.

1. Let us suppose them to have been frauds of the 4th century. Transcripts of the MS. then made would follow one another in due course; and the whole train of phenomena would be produced naturally, which the comparison of our MSS. now shows. From these MSS. we should infer, as we do now, the existence of a more ancient archetype, pointing again by some defects to a still earlier original.

2. If, on the other hand, we suppose our epistles to have been late frauds, the three MSS. will be forgeries, and must have been written by the same man, or at least have been the offspring of one and the same mind. In this case the archetype may have been the forger's own original draft (or somebody else's draft), or possibly only in his thoughts. But whether it were there only, or also in writing, the three MSS. would be carefully referred to this archetype; and the departures from it would be so contrived as to imitate what would come to pass in the natural order of things. The object in forging three MSS. would be to have, as we have now, three distinct witnesses to our epistles; and consequently the

very same phenomena would be found which now appear in A. C. and S. if only the forger's skill were sufficient. The work would not be easy, and it is probable that the forger, however careful, would be betrayed into some inconsistencies, and we shall show presently that such inconsistencies do exist in the case of our epistles.

It would seem then that the inferences, which are fairly enough drawn from the comparison of A. C. and S. with one another, cannot be held to prove the genuineness of our epistles.

§ 3.

3. We have already pointed out (in § 2) that forged MSS., when compared together, must necessarily present the same phenomena as genuine ones. For the forger will have in his mind the archetype, from which he intentionally departs from time to time. Guided by his experience of ancient writings, he will introduce the mistakes and alterations of which he conceives that the honest scribe, whose part for the moment he plays, would be guilty. If, however, he has writings of considerable length to forge, or if he has more writings than one in hand at the same time, it is more than probable that he will fall into some inconsistencies through his forgetfulness of the part which, for the time being, he is assuming. These will occur, however, not in the forms of the letters, and the like, of which his eye would at once inform him, but in the alterations of the original text. Something of this kind, it might be contended, would seem to have actually befallen the Epistles of Clement. Dr. Donaldson, in *The Theological Review* for January 1877, has a keen and critical article upon "The New MS. (C.) of Clement of Rome." On p. 40, he calls attention to certain differences between A. and C., "a large number of which," he says, "consist in the adoption of different tenses." These, he thinks, must be "the result of deliberate alteration." On p. 41, after speaking of some instances in which the readings of C. are, in his judgment, to be preferred, Dr. Donaldson writes:—

"But, strangely enough, when we come to the 2d Epistle, we are forced to an opposite conclusion. There is the same deliberate altera-

tion; but in all cases the Alexandrian Codex seems to us correct, and the Constantinopolitan wrong."

And yet the two epistles in A. are said to be by the same hand; a remark which applies equally to C., for anything that appears in Bryennios to the contrary. On p. 42, Dr. Donaldson points out that A.

"has many Hellenistic forms, where C. has the Attic forms, or rather the forms of the κοινή διάλεκτος;" but he adds, that C. "is not altogether free from freaks in this matter."

We do not, of course, contend that these things are not capable of an honest explanation, or that Dr. Donaldson's own solutions are not admissible. We only urge that the inconsistencies, of which we spoke just now as probable, are actually found when A. and C. are compared, and that their presence suggests a careful inquiry as to how they have arisen.

§ 4.

It will now be proper to consider whether the idea of forgery, at any rate of a late date, is inconsistent with the ascertained history of our MSS.

We have already said that Cyril Lucar, the reforming Patriarch of Constantinople, gave the Codex Alexandrinus, to which A. is appended, to Charles I. in 1628. We need not doubt that he brought it with him from Alexandria; and we may think, if we please, that he took it with him to Alexandria. The ownership of A. cannot be traced back beyond Cyril.

Canon Lightfoot, in speaking of the commission to purchase S., makes the following remarks:—

"The Syndicate of the Cambridge University Library, when they gave a commission for its purchase, were not sanguine enough to suppose that the entry in the catalogue would prove correct.—It seemed incredible that such a treasure as a Syriac version of the Epistles to the Corinthians, forming part of a well-known collection, should have escaped the notice of all Oriental scholars in France."—P. 232.

It is not known who was the previous possessor of this "the only Syriac ms. in M. Mohl's collection."

With respect to the discovery of C., Lightfoot remarks:—

"It is strange that this discovery should not have been made

before. The library of the Most Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople is attached to the patriarchate of Jerusalem in that city, and therefore has something of a public character. It has moreover been examined more than once by learned men from Western Europe."—P. 225.

The Canon states that a catalogue of the MSS. in this library was made by Bethmann, and that no mention of C. is found in that catalogue. Dr. Donaldson, in *The Theological Review* (Jan. 1877, p. 36), calls attention to the insufficiency of the evidence. He complains that Bryennios "supplies us with no external testimony to its antiquity," and argues that "when a MS. is discovered, all the external testimony that can be adduced should be adduced." Speaking of information which might have been given as to the Codex Sinaiticus, he says:—

"All this information would be exceedingly interesting in itself, and very valuable for posterity. This generation may have perfect confidence in Bryennius and Tischendorf. But circumstances might arise at a long subsequent period which might awaken doubts as to the genuineness of the manuscripts. The appeal to internal evidence may prove to be unsatisfactory. And then what is there? It might well be urged, that if a Tischendorf were inclined to forge a manuscript, he had unrivalled opportunities of so doing. No one was so well versed in manuscripts as he. None knew so well all the forms of the letters, all the mistakes of copyists, all the various readings. And it might also be said that there is no guarantee that the terrible results of a discovery of such a practice would be sufficiently deterrent. Chatterton was not deterred. Constantine Simonides was not deterred. Nor were these influenced by a base love of gain, but an eager desire to show their power. A fascination was upon them which blinded them to all consequences. We cannot, therefore, but think it a grave error both in Tischendorf and Bryennius that they have not adduced external testimony to the history of their MSS."—P. 37.

Dr. Donaldson's remarks forcibly point out the importance of the fact that there is no external testimony to the antiquity of our three MSS. A. C. S.

§ 5.

Clement's 1st Epistle contains a statement which has strangely remained unnoticed by antiquity.

In *Ep.* i. 5, Clement speaks of S. Paul as preaching to the whole world, and going ἐπὶ τὸ ἔσχατον τῆς δύσεως. Lightfoot translates this expression by “the extreme west.” He says:—

“In the Epistle to the Romans (xv. 24) S. Paul had stated his intention of visiting Spain. From the language of Clement here it appears that this intention was fulfilled.”

In corroboration of this statement Lightfoot refers to *Fragm. Murat.* only. In support of his translation of the Greek expression he gives some references. He adds some other interpretations which have been proposed, and ends his note by saying:—

“Such attempts are a strong testimony to the plain inference which follows from the passage simply interpreted.”

Clement's words, then, are very important, and stand almost alone in early times as throwing any light upon the history of S. Paul beyond what the N. T. affords. On this account, ever since they were first printed in 1633, they have been constantly referred to; and yet prior to that time no mention of them can be found. We readily allow that the appeal to the silence of antiquity is oftentimes precarious. This, however, is no ordinary case. The statement concerning the apostle is supposed to occur in a document described by Jerome (*De Vir. Illustr.* 15) as—

“valde utilem epistolam, quæ et in nonnullis locis publice legitur,”

and with which he was so well acquainted that he adds:—

“Quæ mihi videtur characteri epistolæ, quæ sub Pauli nomine ad Hebræos fertur, convenire.”

Jerome, nevertheless, preserves a profound silence as to this statement of Clement, even when, as in *De Vir. Illustr.* 5, he is giving an account of S. Paul, and actually mentioning Clement's name. In his *Comment. in Isa.* ix. 1, p. 130, Jerome speaks of the extent of S. Paul's preaching. The quotation of Clement would be exceedingly appropriate. He does not give it, though on Isa. lii. he quotes Clement by name. See also *Jer. Isa.* xi. 10, 11, p. 163. In his comment on Eph. iii. 13, Jerome writes concerning S. Paul:—

“Videbat quippe se de Jerusalem usque ad Illyricum Evangelium prædicasse, ipse Romam, ad Hispanias, vel perrexisset, vel ire dis-

ponere. Totus mundus ad doctrinam ipsius de potestate principis tollebatur," etc.—P. 596.

He makes no mention of Clement's statement, though in the previous chapter (ii. 2), as well as in the following one (iv. 1), he quotes Clement, and by name. An argument of exactly the same kind might be founded on the comparison of *Cyr. Jer. Cat.* xviii. 8 with *Cat.* xvii. 26. It is certainly a noteworthy fact that Clement's words should have been so persistently ignored by antiquity. We cannot help adding that we should expect that a forger, with his eye perhaps on some local controversy, would here and there err by saying a little too much.

§ 6.

Some passages which ought to be found in our epistles, now that we have them, as is alleged, in a complete form, are not found there.

(1.) Pseudo-Justin, *Quæst. ad Orthod.* 74, writes: εἰ τῆς παρούσης καταστάσεως τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν ἡ διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς κρίσις τῶν ἀσεβῶν, καθά φασιν αἱ Γραφαὶ προφητῶν τε καὶ ἀποστόλων, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς Σιβύλλης, καθὼς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Κλήμης ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ. The 2d Epistle of Clement, as we now have it, sufficiently satisfies the first part of pseudo-Justin's reference; but neither the 1st nor the 2d has any mention of the Sibyl. To account for this, the possibility of a lacuna in some portion of the 2d Epistle has been suggested; so also has the possibility of a corruption in pseudo-Justin's text. Such suggestions point out the inference which naturally follows from this omission of the Sibyl's name.

We must now notice a circumstance which, though it will throw little actual light upon this point, will, to say the least, do nothing to remove from our minds any suspicions that this omission may have given rise to. In *Apost. Const.* v. 7 there is an account of the phoenix, which is thought to be in part taken from Clement's *Ep.* i. 25. It is immediately preceded by the lines of the Sibyl to which pseudo-Justin refers. If we compare the context in the *Apost. Const.* with that in pseudo-Justin, we see some reason for supposing that the one has copied from the other. Thus both writers speak of a certain conflict between the Christian and the Gentile. Both

speak of the Scriptures, and both call them αἱ γραφαί. Both of them speak of Daniel, the one before, the other after the reference to the Sibyl. Both use the exact word ἀσεβῶν. The one follows the quotation with εἰ τοίνυν . . . μάτην, and presently εἰ τοίνυν . . . τί μάτην, the other with ἄλλως τε εἰ . . . πῶς οὐ μάτην. The one writes καὶ ἡ αὐτῶν προφητὶς, the other καὶ τινες αὐτῶν. The closing words of *Quest.* lxxiii. (that is to say, only twelve lines above the passage quoted) are τὸ θέσιμ τοῦ ὄντος διδόμεν τῷ μὴ ὄντι, ἀλλὰ τὴν παντελῆ ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ μὴ ὄντος. In the *Apost. Const.*, almost immediately after the account of the phoenix, and still in c. 7, we find καὶ τότε μὲν μὴ ὄντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ διαφόρων ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον, δοῦς αὐτῷ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος. It is difficult to suppose that all these coincidences, taken in connection with the lines quoted or referred to, can be accidental. We may think that there is something behind the scenes in this reference to the Sibyl which is not straightforward. It would be easy to give a conjectural explanation. It would be, however, just as arbitrary as the conjecture of a lacuna, or a corruption in the text. If we prefer to think that both the writer of the *Constitutions* and pseudo-Justin were indebted to the true Clement, we shall only make the omission of the Sibyl's name in our epistles a still more important matter.

[We have three reasons for believing that pseudo-Justin's reference was fully satisfied in the original draft of Clement's *Ep.* i.

1. Because pseudo-Justin *does* refer to *Ep.* i.,—this is the natural, if not the necessary conclusion from his words,—and his writings were well known to our author.

2. Because the writer of *Peregrinus* amuses himself with the very lines to which pseudo-Justin refers, and which are quoted in the *Apost. Const.*

In § 29 the writer cites some Sibylline verses which he supposes Theagenes to have introduced into his speech in honour of Proteus (*vid. sup.* p. 32). He follows these immediately by a mocking oracular utterance attributed to Bacis: φησὶ δὲ ὁ Βάκισ οὕτω σφύδρα εὔ ἐπειπῶν, Ἀλλ' ὁπίταν κ.τ.λ. The third line begins with δὴ τότε τοὺς ἄλλους. The supposed Sibylline verses, which speak of the fire into which Proteus was to leap, and of the blessedness which he was thereby to attain (compare), begin with ἀλλ' ὁπίταν, and the fourth line with δὴ τότε πάντα. The writer of the *Apost. Const.* introduces the Sibyl οὕτω πως αὐτοῖς λέγουσα κατὰ λέξιν. Ἀλλ' ὁπίτ' ἤδη κ.τ.λ. The fifth line begins with καὶ τότε δὴ. The writer uses ἐπειπῶν (an

uncommon word) a few lines above. The verses are upon the fire one day to overtake the world, upon the reward of the godly, and the punishment of the ungodly. But this is not all; for both writers here speak of the phœnix, the one before, the other after the citation of the verses. These coincidences cannot be accidental, and in themselves alone go a long way towards proving that *Peregrinus* was not written by Lucian. Seeing then that pseudo-Justin declares that there was in Clement a reference to the Sibylline verses upon the destruction of the world by fire,—a declaration which, as we shall see directly, is partly borne out by Irenæus,—and that the author of *Peregrinus* jests upon the very verses which must have been in Clement if any were there, and that the connection between Clement's Epistles and *Peregrinus* is of the most intimate character, it is reasonable to conclude that the verses in question, and the subject of which they treat, did originally form part of Clement's *Ep. i.*

3. We have a third reason for concluding such to have been the case. We believe that the exact spot which these verses occupied in *Ep. i.* can be determined with a considerable amount of accuracy.

Lightfoot, before the discovery of C., supposed that the close of the 1st Epistle dwelt upon the end of all things,—the destruction of the world by fire. "For such a conclusion," he says, "the threats taken from the Book of Proverbs (§ 57) would prepare the way; and it would form a fit termination to a letter of warning," p. 167. The close of the epistle would therefore be the natural place to look for indications that such an allusion had at one time actually been made. But on that very account any indications that might be found would be of very small value. We shall therefore make no search in that direction.

In the *Apost. Const.* the Sibylline verses are in close connection with the phœnix, for the account of which the writer seems to be indebted to the description of that bird which occupies the whole of Clement's *Ep. i.* 25. In *Peregrinus* there is a brief mention of the phœnix. This is followed by a glance at the "resurrection" in the writer's own fashion, and by a scoffing allusion to the miracles sometimes supposed to have been worked by saints after their death, and then by the mock Sibylline verses. These authorities thus mark out the neighbourhood of Clement's § 25 as the position which the Sibylline verses once occupied in this epistle. If we may trust *Peregrinus*, they stood after § 25, and not before it. Here, then, we have a definite spot marked out for us, but not, as at the close of the epistle, by a line of thought which would make the subject of the destruction of the world by fire natural and fitting. Indications that such a subject was once treated of, if they can be found here, will be far more noticeable than if they were found at the close of the epistle.

Clement's § 26 contains less than nine lines. Half of these are occupied by two quotations; in the remaining lines a coincidence is found with the *Apost. Const.* in its account of the phoenix. In the first sentence of § 28, Clement has ἀπολείπωμεν φαύλων ἔργων μιαιράς ἐπιθυμίας, ἵνα τῷ ἐλέει αὐτοῦ σκεπασθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν μελλόντων κριμάτων (A. C.; τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίματος, S., Light. p. 423). Ποῦ γάρ τις κ.τ.λ. The words τῶν μελλ. κριμ. and still more τοῦ μέλλ. κρίμ. would have been naturally used if § 27—which in its opening sentence speaks of God as faithful in His promises (ἐπαγγελίας) and just in His judgments (κρίμασιν)—had contained an allusion to the destruction of the world by fire. On this subject S. Peter's 2d Epistle is the great authority, and 2 Pet. iii. 7 appears to have been in the mind of pseudo-Justin, as may be seen from the words quoted above. In chap. ii. 20, S. Peter has εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα (comp. with words just given) κ.τ.λ., in iii. 3, 4 κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας (obs.) πορευόμενοι, καὶ λέγοντες Ποῦ (comp. with words just given) κ.τ.λ., in ver. 5 λανθάνει (obs.) γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας (obs.), ὅτι οὐρανοὶ (obs.) ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι, καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα (obs.), τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ (obs.), in vv. 7, 8 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶ, πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων (comp. with pseudo-Just.) ἐν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω κ.τ.λ., in ver. 9 οὐ βραδύνει ὁ Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (comp. with opening sentence of § 27) κ.τ.λ., in ver. 10 ἤξει δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτί, ἐν ᾗ οἱ οὐρανοὶ . . . παρελεύσονται κ.τ.λ. These last words recall S. Matt. xxiv. 33 sq. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδῃτε (obs.) πάντα (obs.) ταῦτα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς (obs.) ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις (ἢ κειν αὐτὸν [θάνατον] ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας αὐτόματον. *Peregrin.* 44). ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ (obs.) ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, ἕως ἂν πάντα ταῦτα γένηται· ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι. Comp. with that portion of § 27 which is quoted on p. 111. Specially observe S. Peter's ver. 5, and the clever turn which is given in Clement to S. Peter's οὐρανοί. These coincidences are strong in themselves, and if the circumstances under which they are found are considered, the conclusion seems almost necessarily to follow that in the original draft of Clement's Epistle the Sibylline verses were contained, and also some quotation from or palpable allusion to 2 Pet. iii., which another hand toned down so as to escape any but the closest scrutiny.

This opinion is to a small extent confirmed by an examination of the language of *Peregrinus*. Pseudo-Lucian speaks of Proteus as hoping to become after death δαίμονα νυκτοφύλακα. No one knows exactly what the writer means. Can it be that νυκτοφύλακα (Xen. *Anab.* vii. 2, referred to on p. 105) is a jesting combination of S. Peter's ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτί in iii. 10, with S. Matthew's ποία φυλακὴ ὁ κλέπτῃς in the parallel verse, c. xxiv. 43? Pseudo-Lucian prefaces his mock Sibylline verses with Θεαγένῃς δὲ ἑναγχοῦς, ὡς μοί τις τῶν

ἑταίρων ἀπήγγειλε, καὶ Σίβυλλαν ἔφη προειρηκέναι περὶ τούτων καὶ τὰ ἔπη γὰρ ἀπομνημόνευεν. Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 2 μνησθῆναι (obs.) τῶν προειρημένων (obs.) ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν (προφῆτις Σίβυλλα *Apost. Const.*), and ver. 15 καθὼς (comp. here) καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος . . . ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων (obs.).

On p. 117 the close connection between Clement's § 27 and *Theoph.* xxxi. is pointed out. On p. 122, a coincidence between § 27 and *Theoph.* iii. is shown. With the words given, comp. ὁ δυνάμει τὸ μὴ ὄν εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγαγών, found here in the *Apost. Const.* in the account of the phoenix.

We conclude, therefore, for the foregoing reasons that the Sibylline verses, together with an allusion very much in the words of S. Peter, originally stood in Clement's *Ep.* i. 27. The hand of a reviser struck out the verses and toned down the language of S. Peter, so that there might be no obvious reference to S. Peter's 2d Epistle. Both these things he would naturally do, for he could not prove the Sibylline verses to be ancient, and might well suspect them to have been written after the times of Clement of Rome, and the 2d Epistle of S. Peter is not manifestly used, as the reviser would know very well, by any early Christian writer. Both Erasmus and Calvin, as we may remember, expressed doubts concerning its authenticity. The reviser may have shared their doubts.

We have not space to state and examine our reasons for supposing Clement's Epistles to have been revised by a somewhat later hand than that which originally drafted them. Such an examination would bring under review almost the whole of that portion of the two epistles which remains untouched in the foregoing pages, as well as the whole of the *Epistle to Diognetus*. The question is of no importance to the object of the present volume, which is simply to prove that a great literary fraud was committed at a very late date. We record our opinion, and point to the curious facts connected with the Sibylline verses as to some extent a confirmation of it, merely as a suggestion to any person who may feel disposed to act upon it.]

(2.) Irenæus (*Hær.* iii. 3. 3) writes:—

ἐπὶ τούτου οὖν τοῦ Κλήμεντος στάσεως οὐκ ὀλίγης τοῖς ἐν Κορίνθῳ γενομένης ἀδελφοῖς, ἐπέστειλεν ἡ ἐν Ῥώμῃ Ἐκκλησία ἱκανωτάτην γραφὴν τοῖς Κορινθίοις, εἰς εἰρήνην συμβιβάζουσα αὐτούς, καὶ ἀνανεοῦσα τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἣν νεωστὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσιν εἰλήφει, annuntiantem unum Deum omnipotentem, factorem cœli et terræ, plasmatorem hominis, qui induxerit cataclysmum et advocaverit Abraham, qui eduxerit populum de terra Ægypti, qui collocutus sit Moysi, qui legem disposuerit et prophetas miserit, qui ignem præparaverit diabolo et angelis ejus.

It was on the strength of this passage that Lightfoot, writing before the discovery of C., concluded that the words of pseudo-Justin, given on p. 332, referred to the missing portion of Clement's 1st Epistle. He says:—

“This description corresponds with the contents of our epistle, excepting the last clause which I have italicized; and the insertion of a statement so remarkable could not have been an accidental error on the part of Irenæus. Wotton indeed supposes that these words do not give the contents of Clement's epistle, but that Irenæus is describing in his own language the general substance of the Apostolic tradition. To this interpretation however the subjunctive *præparaverit* is fatal, for it shows that the narrative is oblique and that Irenæus is speaking in the words of another. It seems then that Clement towards the close of the epistle dwelt upon the end of all things, the destruction of the world by fire.”—P. 166.

There is nothing, however, in the newly-discovered portion of our 1st Epistle to answer to the italicized clause. Still it must be remarked that the force of Canon Lightfoot's arguments is in no respect weakened by anything that has come to light. There is no better reason now than formerly for supposing “an accidental error” on the part of Irenæus. The argument founded on the word *præparaverit* is precisely what it was. So far, indeed, from being weakened, the general argument is made far stronger by the new discovery. It is now thought to be possible to identify Irenæus' *ἰκανωτάτην γράφην* as the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians now in our hands. In *Ep.* i. 62, Clement writes: *περὶ μὲν τῶν ἀνηκόντων τῇ θρησκείᾳ ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν ὠφελιμωτάτων . . . ἰκανῶς ἐπεστείλαμεν ὑμῖν*. On this Bryennios refers to the passage from Irenæus quoted above. The writer of the article on *Clemens Romanus* in the *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* (Smith and Wace) observes: “It may be added, that the epithet applied by Irenæus to the epistle *ἰκανωτάτη* turns out to have been suggested by a phrase in the letter itself, *ἰκανῶς ἐπεστείλαμεν*” (p. 558). Whether it is quite fair to claim in this way the testimony of Irenæus to our epistle, without a word to show that this testimony breaks down utterly in one very important particular, we leave to our readers to decide.

The case stands thus. From the discovery of the new mss., we have stronger reason than formerly for supposing Clement's

1st Epistle to be referred to by Irenæus, and therefore for expecting to find in it something answering to the italicized clause given above. There is, however, nothing. While we believed in the honesty of our epistles, we took refuge in the conjecture that Irenæus included the 2d Epistle (which might perhaps be held to justify his language) with the 1st. We had not then observed that Clement's *ἱκανῶς ἐπιστείλαμεν*, in *Ep.* i. 62, seems distinctly to point out the 1st Epistle as the *ἱκανωτάτη γραφή* of Irenæus; nor yet that his *ὠφελιμωτάτων*, in the same sentence, must have in like manner either suggested or been suggested by the *valde utilem epistolam* of Jerome, *De Vir. Illustr.* 15. It seems strange that Irenæus should fix upon the one word, and Jerome upon the other. It seems altogether more natural to suppose that the sentence, in which these coincidences are found, was written by some one perfectly familiar with the two accounts of Clement's Epistles, and who intentionally glances at the one with his *ἱκανῶς*, and at the other with his *ὠφελιμωτάτων*. If we entertain the idea of forgery, the explanation of the omission, which has been pointed out, is so simple that it can hardly be called a conjecture. The Greek, which gives the coincidence between our epistle and Irenæus, is found only in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 6. The Latin continuation of the quotation is in Irenæus only. The forger, we may think, failed to compare, sufficiently at any rate, Eusebius and Irenæus. It was one of the pitfalls into which a forger was likely to stumble.

(3.) John of Damascus, *Sacr. Par.* (ms. Rupef.) p. 787, gives a short passage, as from the 2d Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. It is not, however, to be found in either epistle. Lightfoot, in his *Addenda*, p. 459, writes:—

“I seem to see now that the style of the fragment quoted by the pseudo-Damascene betrays a different hand from our author's. Its vocabulary is more philosophical, and altogether it shows more literary skill.”

He therefore supposes the omission to have arisen from some displacement of the pseudo-Damascene's memoranda.

[The inconsistency in vocabulary and style fully accounts for the excision of the passage by the later hand, who in Clement's *Ep.* ii. plays the part of an author of small literary ability. See the account of *Ep.* ii. in Phot. *Bibl.* 126, quoted on p. 249.]

APPENDIX A.

We shall begin our examination of the Epistles of Clement by referring to Diodorus Siculus. He lived about B.C. 59. The coincidences, therefore, which we shall bring forward cannot be escaped on the plea that Diodorus was possibly acquainted with our epistles. But where shall we open the two folio volumes of our edition? If the things which we have to mention are purely accidental, it cannot matter where we open the volumes, nor whether the writings which we offer for comparison with the pages of Diodorus be the Epistles of Clement or that to Diognetus, the Apologies of Justin or the Homilies of Basil. The history of Diodorus is as much, or as little, related to one as to another. We shall not, however, open the volumes of Diodorus at haphazard, but P. 202. we shall take the hint which Cedrenus (art. 2, "Diognet.") supplies, and refer to Diodorus' narrative of the behaviour of P. 200. Alexander to the wife and daughters of Darius. This, with the portion of history which leads up to it, begins *lib.* xvii. 31, p. 182.

On this page Diodorus writes: ἀποστέλλειν στρατηγὸν . . . τῆς ἀδίκου τιμωρίας . . . διὰ παρῤῥησίαν ἄκαιρον τοιαύτην ἔσχε τὴν τοῦ βίου καταστροφὴν . . . διόπερ ὀνειροπολούμενος ταῖς Μακεδόνων ἀρεταῖς, καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν λαμβάνων ἐζήτει, στρατηγὸν ἀξιόχρεων, τὸν διαδεξόμενον τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. Comp. 3 Macc. iv. 1, μετὰ παρῤῥησίας; ver. 4, οὕτω γὰρ μετὰ πικρᾶς καὶ ἀνοίκτου ψυχῆς ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν στρατηγῶν P. 229. ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐξαποστέλλοντο, ὥστε ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐξάλλοις τιμωρίαις καὶ τινὰς τῶν ἐχθρῶν, λαμβάνοντας πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὸν κοινὸν ἔλεον, καὶ λογιζομένους τὴν ἄδελφον τοῦ βίου καταστροφὴν, δακρύνειν αὐτῶν τρισάθλιον ἐξαποστολήν. This looks like obligation on one side or the other. Clement, however, writes in *Ep.* i. 5: λαβόμεν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους. Ὁ Πέτρος κ.τ.λ. No argument can, of course, be founded on the use of the expression λαβ. πρὸ ὀφθαλ. in itself. Still it shows a possible connection of Clement with Diodorus, or with 3 Macc., or with both. It suggests further examination in Pp. 173, both directions. There are some few indications of Clement's 229 sq.

knowledge of 3 Macc. These will be fully considered hereafter. Our business now is with Diodorus. The ἐξαποστολήν of 3 Macc. may have attracted attention, and have given rise to Clement's ἀποστόλους. Such a conjecture no doubt implies that, in our opinion, the writer of the epistles did not possess that grave and reverent spirit naturally to be looked for in Clement of Rome. This charge is perhaps made a little prematurely on our part. Sooner or later it must be made. It may be thought, moreover, that something of a jesting disposition lies in Clement's selection of ἀγαθούς as applied to the apostles. On the use of this epithet, Lightfoot remarks

P. 22. (p. 406): "Harnack appositely quotes *Clem. Hom.* i. 16 ὁ δ' ἀγαθὸς Πέτρος προσπηδήσας, κ.τ.λ." The *Homily* describes the introduction of Clement to S. Peter, and it was upon the mention of his name that the apostle sprung up and kissed him, and showed him every mark of attention. The epithet ἀγαθός is thus most appropriate in Clement's mouth, who, as we see above, has S. Peter specially in his mind, and perhaps marks his remembrance of that touching scene.

On the same page (p. 182) Diodorus uses the word κατήντησαν. In *Ep.* i. 6, only a few lines, that is, below the coincidence with Diodorus pointed out above, Clement has ἐπὶ . . . δρόμον κατήντησαν. We shall have occasion to deal with these same pages of Diodorus in our next chapter, and we shall then show how δρόμον comes to be associated with καταντᾶν.

On p. 185 (we shall return to the intervening pages directly) Diodorus writes: καὶ νομίσας τὸ φιλάδελφον τῆς ψυχῆς οἷσιν αὐτῷ περιβόητον παρὰ Πέρσαις δόξαν; and presently λῦσαι τὴν σεμνότητα τῆς προστασίας, καὶ τὸν παρὰ Πέρσαις τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κείμενον νόμον ὑπερβῆναι. Comp. τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς περιβοήτου φιλαδελφίας, *Ep.* i. 47, and μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὀρισμὲνον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα ἐν σεμνότητι, *Ep.* i. 41.

Clement, perhaps, was curious about the word περιβόητος, which is found in the LXX. in 2 Macc. ii. 23, and not at all in the N. T. In *lib.* xiv. 76, p. 701, Diodorus writes: ὅπως μὴ τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τῇ φύσει θάνατον ἀποδοὺς ἀθῶος γένηται, τῶν ἀσεβημάτων (ἀμαρτημάτων, just below), ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πατρίδι περιβόητον ἔχη τὸν βίον, ὑπὸ πάντων ὀνειδιζόμενος· εἰς τοσοῦτο
P. 209. (τοσοῦτον, v.l.) δ' ἦλθεν ἀτυχίας. . . . πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐξέκαυσαν. . . . ἄξιόχρεους. This is a remarkable passage. Cf. ἀθῶος εἶναι

... οὐκ ἂν ἀξιόχρεως ἐγένετο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου θανάτου τὸ ἡμέτερον ἀποδιδόναι ὄφλημα . . ., Steph. *Rud. Fid.* p. 45; and ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀθάροι ἐσόμεθα ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἁμαρτίας, *Ep.* i. 59; and ἦν ὀλίγα πρόσωπα προπετῇ καὶ αὐθάδῃ ὑπάρχοντα εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀπονοίας ἐξέκαυσαν, ὥστε τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ περιβόητον κ.τ.λ., *Ep.* i. 1. Returning now to p. 188, we find Diodorus speaking of Alexander's kindness to the family of Darius, and saying πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν ἔργων ὑπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου συντελεσμένων μηδὲν τούτων μεῖζον ὑπάρχειν μηδὲ μᾶλλον ἄξιον ἀναγραφῆς καὶ μνήμης ἱστορικῆς εἶναι. We call to mind a parallel passage in *lib.* i. 3, p. 7: ἱστορικὴν . . . εἰ γάρ τις τὰς εἰς μνήμην παραδεδομένας τοῦ συμπάντος κόσμου πράξεις; and πολλῶν δὲ καὶ μεγάλων τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα πράξεων P. 289. ἀπολελειμμένων μεχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς βίου, p. 6. Comp. πολλῶν οὖν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων μετεκληφότες πράξεων ἐπαναδράμωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραδεδομένον ἡμῖν τῆς εἰρήνης σκοπόν, καὶ ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸν Πατέρα καὶ κτιστὴν τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου, καὶ ταῖς μεγαλοπρεπέσι καὶ ὑπερβαλλούσαις αὐτοῦ δωρεαῖς τῆς εἰρήνης εὐεργεσίαις τε κολληθῶμεν, *Ep.* i. 19. In Diodorus, p. 189, we have μεγαλοπρεπεῖς θυσίας . . . τιμήσας ταῖς ἀξίαις ἐκάστους δωρεαῖς (ἐπανατρέχω πρὸς τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Δεσπότην, *Bas. Ps.* cxv. 5, P. 130. p. 375; μεγάλαι δὲ καὶ ὑπερβάλλουσαι δωρεαί—δωρεᾶς καὶ ὑπερβαλλούσης εὐεργεσίας, *Philo.* i. pp. 587, 588). It would certainly seem that a great part of Clement's sentence is made up out of Diodorus. There is more to be said, however. The passage of Diodorus (p. 188) just quoted, concerning Alexander, reminded us of a saying of Agesilaus to much the same effect, recorded by Plutarch, *Mor.* p. 215. We read through Plutarch's account of Agesilaus on Cedrenus' suggestion, as we have shown in art. 2, "Diognet." Plutarch writes: εἰ γάρ τι καλὸν ἔργον πεποίηκα, τοῦτο μου μνημεῖον ἔσται, εἰδὲ μή, οὐδ' οἱ πάντες ἀνδριάντες, βαναύσαν οὐδενὸς ἀξίων ἔργα ὄντες. Comp. οὐδὲν βάνουσον ἐν ἀγάπῃ, *Ep.* i. 49. Four lines above we observe τὸ μεγαλεῖον used also by Plutarch, p. 214. On the same page Plutarch has the rare word δισταγμός, for which see *Ep.* i. 46.

On p. 184 is c. 33. This chapter might be thought, by one on the look-out for such resemblances, to have something in common with the scriptural narrative of the taking of Jericho. It opens with the mention of spies, and gives a description of a battle in which the sounding of the trumpet and the shouting

of the armies hold a very conspicuous position. There is a verbal coincidence with Josh. vi. 20. Clement must have observed this, for there are altogether too many coincidences here with his *Ep.* i. 12 to be accidental. In this section, which we shall give entire, Clement speaks of the hospitable conduct of Rahab to the spies who had been sent to view Jericho.

§ 12.

1. Διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐσώθη Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη. 2. ἐκπεμφθέντων γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῆ κατασκόπων εἰς Ἱεριχῶν, ἔγνω ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς γῆς ὅτι ἤκασι κατασκοπεῦσαι τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐξέπεμψεν ἄνδρας τοὺς συλληφόμενους αὐτούς, ὅπως συλληφθέντες θανατωθῶσιν. 3. ἡ οὖν φιλόξενος Ῥαὰβ εἰσδεξαμένη αὐτοὺς ἔκρυψεν εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον ὑπὸ τὴν λινοκαλάμην. 4. ἐπισταθέντων δὲ τῶν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ λεγόντων Πρὸς σέ εἰσῆλθον οἱ κατασκοποῖ τῆς γῆς ἡμῶν, ἐξάγαγε αὐτούς. 5. ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς οὕτω κελεύει, ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη Εἰσῆλθον μὲν οἱ ἄνδρες οὐς ζητεῖτε πρὸς με, ἀλλ' εὐθέως ἐξῆλθον καὶ πορεύονται τῇ ὁδῷ, ὑποδεικνύουσα¹ αὐτοῖς ἐναλλάξ. 6. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας Γινώσκουσα γινώσκω ἐγὼ ὅτι κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν παραδίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὴν γῆν (Α. πόλιν) ταύτην. 7. ὁ γὰρ φόβος καὶ ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν ἐπέπεσε τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν. 8. ὡς ἐὰν οὖν γένηται λαβεῖν αὐτήν ὑμᾶς, διασώσατέ με καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου. 9. καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῇ Ἔσται οὕτως ὡς λελάληκας ἡμῖν ὡς ἐὰν οὖν γνῶς παραγενομένους ἡμᾶς, συνάξεις πάντας τοὺς σοὺς ὑπὸ τὸ στέγος, καὶ διασωθήσονται ὅσοι γὰρ ἂν εὐρεθῶσιν ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας, ἀπολοῦνται. 10. καὶ προσέθεντο αὐτῇ δοῦναι σημεῖον, ὅπως ἐκκρεμάσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτῆς κόκκινον, πρόδηλον ποιοῦντες, ὅτι διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου λύτρωσις ἔσται πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἐλπίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν. 11. ὁρᾷτε, ἀγαπητοί, ὅτι οὐ μόνον πίστις ἀλλὰ καὶ προφητεία ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ ἐγενήθη;

(The text of this section is that of Bryennios. For the sake of convenience we have, however, broken it up into paragraphs.)

Diodorus, c. 33, begins with τῶν κατασκόπων. Clement has the exact word in par. 2. On p. 183, Diodorus has προσέθεντο; Clement uses the exact word in par. 10. Diodorus, in c. 33,

¹ Comp. with pars. 3, 4, 5: τοῦ βασιλέως τοὺς φίλους ἐκδεχομένης ὁ Ἑρμῶν παραστὰς ἐκάλει πρὸς τὴν ἕξοδον, ὑποδεικνύων, κ.τ.λ., 3 Macc. v. 26. A connection between 3 Macc. and the pages of Diodorus which we are using is pointed out above.

has the word² ἐναλλάξ; so has Clement in par. 5. Diodorus' language here, as also in *lib.* xi. 22, p. 421, would suggest Clement's interpretation, "in opposite directions." In some of the MSS. of Diodorus, in the place last referred to, ἐναλλάξ is omitted. Accordingly, A. has only the first letter of the word and the first stroke of the second. We say *accordingly*, because we shall see hereafter not a few instances of the same kind of coincidence. Lightfoot calls attention to the construction in par. 2: τοὺς συλλ. κ.τ.λ. Comp. Diod. p. 183, συλληφθεῖς . . . Pp. 74, 86. Παρμενίωνα μὲν . . . ἀπέστειλε προκαληψόμενον τὰς κ.τ.λ. We have already seen τὸν διαδεζόμενον, p. 182; and on p. 187 we have ἐξέπεμψεν ἕνα τῶν φίλων . . . καὶ παραμυθησόμενον τὰς κ.τ.λ. P. 88. Diodorus has among the last words of c. 32, p. 184, διὰ τῆς ἰδίας κρίσεως προεσήμαινον τοῖς Βαρβάροις τὴν νίκην. Clement ends § 11 with εἰς κρίμα καὶ εἰς σημείωσις πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς γίνονται.

It is simply impossible that the coincidences which we have now given out of Diodorus with Clement's Epistles—notably with *Ep.* i. 12—can have arisen accidentally. If any of our readers are still unconvinced on this point, let them turn to chap. ii. We must conclude, therefore, that Diodorus was used. P. 263 sq.

If, however, Clement made use of Diodorus in *Ep.* i. 12, he must have done so in jest. It is therefore probable that if the section be closely examined, other things will be found of the same character.

Josh. ii. supplies Clement with the story of Rahab, but not with the language which he puts into the mouths of the various speakers. Ver. 6 of that chapter describes Rahab as taking the spies ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα (ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος). Clement, in par. 3, takes them εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον. His word, στέγος, in par. 9, moreover, is not found in Josh. ii., nor, indeed, anywhere in the LXX. except in *Ep. Jer.* 10,³ where it is used in a bad sense. From these things one would feel disposed to argue that Clement had not the Book of Joshua in his hands, or even very clearly P. 45.

² Part of a bedstead is called ἐναλλάκτης (crossbar?) in *Evang. Thom.* A. 13, P. 65. p. 144, Tischendorf, 1853. Aquila (Isa. iii. 4) uses the word in the sense of "exchanger." It is not found elsewhere. See note 8 of this chapter.

³ στέγος is here a *v.l.* Accordingly A. reads: τοιοῦτος, Light. p. 65, where see his note.

in his mind. Lightfoot pleads "a slip of memory," and a possible lack of "familiarity with Eastern customs," as excuses for Clement's inapplicable ὑπερῶν. But, on the other hand, we cannot fail to see that Clement takes a very deep interest in the contents of Josh. ii. There are not wanting indications that he was familiar with its language. The ἡκασί κατασκοπεῦσαι, for example, of par. 2 is exactly found in Josh. ii. 3. Besides, on par. 7 the editors point out that Clement "seems to have had in his copy of the LXX. (Josh. ii. 9) certain words which are wanting in all the best mss., though supplied in the Complutensian edition, and represented in the original Hebrew." These things do not seem quite consistent, and lead one to suspect that there is more behind than meets the eye.

We notice that Clement speaks of the scarlet thread (τὸ κόκκινον). There is no reason why he should not, for it is a distinctive feature in the sacred narrative. We cannot forget, however, that it plays an unpleasant part, if we mistake not, in the accounts which the apocryphal gospels give of the Virgin Mary. We remark, further, that at the close of § 11 Clement uses the expression πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς, as he does also in §§ 7, 51. The expression is identified with the Virgin Mary, and is therefore of frequent use in the apocryphal gospels in connection with her. Having reason to suspect some jesting in Clement's § 12, it is not unnatural to turn to the apocryphal gospels, with which *Diognetus* (cc. xi. xii.) has made us acquainted, for an explanation of it.

- In *Evang. Thom.* A. 9, p. 142 (we have just referred to p. 144), we find ἐν ὑπερῶν followed, after three lines, by ἀπὸ τοῦ στέγου. That the writer is conversant with other forms of expression is evident, for in the same place he writes περὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ δάματος κάτω. In *Ep. Jer.* 10 the words are ταῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ στέγου πορναῖς, with διασώζονται in the next verse. Clement has ὑπὸ τὸ στέγος σου, καὶ διασωθήσονται. There would be, of course, a certain appropriateness in using this word of doubtful meaning in connection with Rahab; and if we may judge from other parts of the apocryphal gospels, the same kind of reason guided their writers in selecting this word for the place in which we have found it. The words of the *Evang.*
- P. 290. *Thom.* are these: κατεπήδησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ στέγου, καὶ ἔστη παρὰ τὸ πτώμα τοῦ παιδίου, καὶ ἔκραξε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ

εἶπεν. In the parallel passage in *Evang. Thom.* B. 8, p. 153, the words are καὶ ἀτενίζοντες ἀνείδιζον αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν εὐθέως κατεπήδησεν ἀπὸ τοῦ διστέγου κ.τ.λ. They seem taken in part from Gen. xxiv. 64, 65, καὶ ἀναβλέψασα Ῥεβέκκα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, εἶδε τὸν Ἰσαάκ· καὶ κατεπήδησεν ἀπὸ τῆς καμήλου. καὶ εἶπε τῷ παιδί, τίς ἐστίν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος ὁ πορευόμενος. Ver. 66, καὶ διηγήσατο ὁ παῖς τῷ Ἰσαάκ. Ver. 67, εἰσῆλθε δὲ Ἰσαάκ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἔλαβε τὴν Ῥεβέκκαν, καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ γυνή. In the opposite page in *Evang. Thom.* A., speaking of our Lord, the writer says: πέμπει αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ ὕδωρ ἀντλήσαι (Gen. xxiv. 43) καὶ φέρειν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ; and in the parallel passage in *Evang. Thom.* B., πορευόμενος δὲ συνεντρίβη ἡ ὑδρία αὐτοῦ with καὶ λαβὼν after one line, and presently, p. 155, διηγήσατο τῇ Μαριὰμ ὁ Ἰωσήφ. It would certainly seem that Gen. xxiv. was used in the *Evang. Thom.* But Clement makes Rahab say: ὥς ἐὰν οὖν γένηται λαβεῖν αὐτὴν ὑμᾶς, διασώσατέ με καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου· καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῇ· Ἔσται οὕτως ὥς ἐλάλησας ἡμῖν, ὥς ἐὰν οὖν γνῶς παραγινόμενους ἡμᾶς. Comp. Gen. xxiv. 67, quoted above, and ver. 7 ὃς ἔλαβέ με ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἧς ἐγεννήθην, ὃς ἐλάλησέ μοι. Clement's words now given remind us of Elijah's ἐὰν ἴδῃς με ἀναλαμβανόμενον ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ ἔσται σοι οὕτως, καὶ ἐὰν μή, οὐ μὴ γένηται. 2 Kings ii. 11. In this chapter we remark ζῆ κύριος καὶ ζῆ κ.τ.λ. several times. In *Ep.* i. 58,⁴ this mode of speech appears. It seems to be taken up in the apocryphal gospels again and again as a joke. 2 Kings ii., moreover, appears to be used in the *Evang. Thom.* in the very place to which we have just been referring. On p. 142, the cursing of Jesus is spoken of, which may be compared with that of Elisha, and the ὑπερῶον spoken of may be nothing else than the little chamber (ὑπερῶον) made for the prophet; and on p. 143 there is an accident with an P. 43, axe, leading to a miracle, which one suspects to be suggested

⁴ ζῆ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ζῆ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Comp. ἀληθῶς λέγετε ὅτι ζῆ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὄντως ἀληθῶς ζῆ ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε, *Evang. Nicod.* xiii. p. 295 (for references to same place see below, c. 4). Basil gives the words just quoted from *Ep.* i. 58 in *De Spir. Sanct.* 29, p. 61, as a quotation P. 259, from Clement of Rome. In the same place Basil refers to Irenæus, Dionysius, and Africanus. In c. 2 we show that Dionysius is used in *Ep.* i. 20, and that the doxology from Basil's quotation of Africanus is used in the same § 20. P. 260. Coincidences with Iren. v. cc. 8, 9, to which Basil refers, are found in *Ep.* ii. 14.

by Elisha's miracle. Moreover, on the same p. 143 it is said : ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἰδὼν τὸ γεγονός προσεκύνησαν τὸ παιδίον, λέγοντες, Ἀληθῶς πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐνοικεῖ ἐν τῷ παιδίῳ τούτῳ ; while in 2 Kings ii. 15 it is said : καὶ εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν . . . Ἐπαναπέπαινται τὸ πνεῦμα Ἐλίου ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίῃ καὶ . . . προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. In ver. 19, ἀτεκνεῖν is used as it also is in *Orat.* iii.

In the *Evang. Thom.*, part B. is only another version of part A., and pp. 143 and 154 are parallel. On p. 154, out of the words given as a parallel to *Diognet.* xi., we observe the words ἀντλήσας ὕδωρ ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς ἐπλησεν αὐτόν. In *Ex.* ii. an account is given of the seven daughters of the priest of Midian, and of their coming to the well to water their father's flock ; and in ver. 16 it is said : παραγενόμεναι δὲ ἤντλουν ἕως ἐπλησεν τὰς δεξαμενάς. This supplies the missing παραγενομένους for § 12, par. 9. (*Ex.* ii. 14 is quoted in *Ep.* i. 4 ; and comp. μὴ ἀνελῆν με σὺ θέλεις with ὅταν θέλῃ ἀνελῆ αὐτήν, *Ep.* i. 21.) The apocryphal gospels take an interest in the early part of the Book of Exodus because of its account of the midwives (see *Protev. Jacob.* xix. p. 34 sq.). For a reason of the same kind they make use of *Gen.* xxxviii. The words of ver. 20, ἀπέστειλε δὲ Ἰούδας . . . κομίσασθαι, offer a parallel to the half-dozen lines p. 154, to which we have already twice referred, where we find ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν Μαριάμ . . . κομίσαι ὕδωρ. These things come too readily to our hands to be accidental, and we therefore cannot but feel certain that there are jesting and unpleasant allusions in the words which Clement puts into the mouth of Rahab in par. 5. This chapter (*Gen.* xxxviii.) has the expression over and over again, εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτήν . . . πρὸς σὲ . . . πρὸς με. Εὐθύς ἐξῆλθεν is said of the birth of Phares. In ver. 4 is συλλαβοῦσα ; in ver. 10, ἐθανάτωσε. In this § 12, Clement has ὅπως συλληφθέντες θανατωθῶσιν. Clement's words, observe, are distinctly chosen by him ; for they are not in the sacred narrative given in *Josh.* ii., which steers quite clear of all doubtful expressions with regard to Rahab. They are, of course, necessary expressions in the narrative of *Gen.* xxxviii. The above conclusion is strengthened by observing that Clement's words, just preceding those which he puts into the mouth of the king's messenger, πρὸς σὲ εἰσῆλθον οἱ κατὰσκοποι τῆς γῆς ἡμῶν, ἐξάγαγε αὐτούς, seem obviously a recollection of the words of

the men of Sodom to Lot ποῦ εἰσιν οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ εἰσελθόντες πρὸς σὲ τὴν νύκτα; ἐξάγαγε αὐτούς, Gen. xix. 5. The words in Joshua are ἐξάγαγε τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς εἰσπεπορευμένους εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν σου τὴν νύκτα, ii. 3. Clement tells the story of Lot in the preceding section (§ 11). The notion that the conversation of this § 12 is a mere patchwork of bits taken here and there, according to the fancy of the writer, is further borne out by the consideration of a sentence given to the spies in par. 9, which we have already partly discussed. The words in Josh. ii. 18 are τὸν δὲ πατέρα σου, καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου, καὶ πάντα τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός σου συνάξεις πρὸς σεαυτὴν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν σου. καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐξέλθῃ τὴν θύραν τῆς οἰκίας σου ἔξω, ἐνοχος ἑαυτῷ ἔσται. There is enough of resemblance here to show that Clement can recollect when he is disposed to do so. And it is none the less plain that his words are an amalgamation of Josh. ii. 18 with Ex. ix. 19 νῦν οὖν κατάσπευσον συναγαγεῖν τὰ κτήνη σου, καὶ ὅσα σοι ἔστιν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ. πάντες γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ τὰ κτήνη, ὅσα ἐὰν εὑρεθῇ ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις, καὶ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς οἰκίαν, πέση δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὰ ἡ χάλαζα, τελευτήσῃ. From Ex. ix. 31 appears to be taken παρεστηκυῖα, used by Clement (*Ep.* i. 23, ii. 11⁶) in what professes to be a quotation.

If § 12 be now examined, it will be found to be covered to a great extent by the references which we have supplied. We shall produce, immediately, one whole sentence and something more out of Origen; and, hereafter, ποιεῖ πρόδηλον, for par. 10, out of a page of Diodorus, and ἀπολοῦνται, for par. 9, out of P. 263 sq. Heb. i.

Let us consider how the case stands with respect to the coincidences already given.

1. For a certain specified reason the historical *Bibliotheca* of Diodorus is opened at a particular page. There, and in the pages immediately following, are found a number of coincidences with Clement's *Ep.* i., and specially with § 12. Accidental coincidences may, no doubt, be occasionally found, but not such as these. These cannot be accidental. It is therefore necessary to suppose that Clement made use of Diodorus. The coincidences with this writer are, however, of such a character as to lead to the idea that the use so made is of a jesting

⁵ εἶτα σταφυλὴ παρστηκυῖα ("ripe"). Lightfoot refers to Ex. ix. 31.

nature. This idea is confirmed by reference to the *Evang. Thom.*, which is nothing else than jest from the beginning to the end.

2. When we became of opinion that § 12 of our 1st Epistle was not written in a very grave and serious spirit, we made some examination of the *Evang. Thom.* We consulted this apocryphal gospel, and a particular page of it, because that page had already supplied us with two parallels for *Diognet.* chap. xi. xii. Let us see how the case stands with respect to this gospel.

The *Evang. Thom.* has two versions, which Tischendorf calls A. and B. A certain page of *Evang. Thom.* B. appears to be used in *Diognetus*. The *Evang. Thom.* A. (in the parallel place) uses the word *ἐναλλάκτης* (see note 2), deriving the meaning apparently from *ἐναλλάξ* when used, as in *Ep.* i. 12, in "the somewhat strange" sense, as Lightfoot remarks, of "crosswise." In the *Evang. Thom.* A., also, and in the same neighbourhood, are found in close companionship two words, which as used by Clement (also in § 12) are noticeable. Investigation of the language of the apocryphal gospel in its parallel places shows that it is taken from various chapters of Holy Scripture. These same chapters supply some coincidences with those conversational parts of § 12 which confessedly are not drawn from Josh. ii., in which chapter they are naturally looked for. It is of course admitted that many of the coincidences are of slight importance, and in themselves alone not at all to be relied upon. The whole case has, however, to be considered; and the aptness with which the coincidences, such as they are, have come to hand, must be observed. Many of these resemblances may be set aside as unworthy of notice, but there will still remain two sets of coincidences—the one with Diodorus, the other with the *Evang. Thom.*—not so summarily to be disposed of. Each of these has its own specially noteworthy features. They are not, however, independent of one another, but are closely connected in the words *ἐναλλάξ* and *ἐναλλάκτης*. It is incredible that this double set of coincidences should have accidentally arisen. It is incumbent on any one who thinks this to be possible, to produce two equally remarkable sets of coincidences for a piece of Greek of equal length with Clement's *Ep.* i. 12, and which he can *prove* to be purely

P. 63.

P. 42 sq.

P. 65.

accidental. He will not then have proved that the coincidences before us *are* accidental, but he will, no doubt, have shown that they *may* be.

The conjecture that the author of the apocryphal gospel was acquainted with Clement's Epistles, we must remark, does not meet the case. It does not explain the phenomena which *Ep.* i. 12 presents. There is plainly a connection of some kind between Clement and the apocryphal gospel. What this is does not yet appear, and we do not intend to discuss the question further at this time. We shall again and again come across the *Evang. Thom.* in the course of our examination of our epistles. For the present we take our stand on the fact, which we think we have sufficiently proved, viz. that our 1st Epistle, in the form in which we now have it, was not written by Clement, Bishop of Rome, but by some later author of an unknown age.

Under this view, then, let us look once more at § 12, and see whether we cannot get some further light upon it. There is no doubt that the epistle, by whomsoever written, was intended to pass as that of Clement of Rome, and to take the place which the genuine epistle once occupied. To sustain the character, it must seem to bear within it the seeds of succeeding Christian thought. It must be so carefully written that succeeding writers, such as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and others, may seem in their language to be recollecting Clement of Rome. It happens that Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 111⁶) speaks of Rahab, and of the scarlet thread as being a symbol of the blood of Christ. Irenæus (iv. 20. 12) speaks also of Rahab. It is quite evident that he has Justin before him. He has, however, a distinct feature in his remarks, for he speaks of Rahab as having been preserved with her whole house "*fide signi coccini*," adding—

"Sicut et Dominus dicebat his qui adventum ejus non excipiebant, Pharissæis scilicet, et coccini signum nullificant, quod erat pascha, *redemptio* et exodus populi ex *Ægypto*."

Origen also writes, in *Jes. Hom.* iii. 4 (tom. ii. p. 403):—

"Sed et ista meretrix, quæ eos suscepit, ex meretrice efficitur jam *propheta*. Dicit enim, *Scio quia Dominus Deus vester tradidit vobis*

⁶ See *Diognet.* vii., where *Dial.* 110 is plainly used.

terram hanc. Vides (cf. par. 11) quomodo illa, quæ aliquando erat meretrix et impia et immunda, nunc jam Spiritu Sancto repleta est; et de præteritis quidem fatetur, de præsentibus vero credit, *propheta autem et prænunciat de futuris.*"

Origen's *propheta* supplies, then, a third distinct feature. The words which Clement, in § 12, par. 6, puts into the mouth of Rahab, are a very nearly exact translation of Origen's. Clement writes: *γινώσκουσα γινώσκω ἐγὼ ὅτι κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν παραδίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὴν γῆν* (A. reads πόλιν) *ταύτην.* In Josh. ii. 9 we read *ἐπισταμαι ὅτι ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν κύριος τὴν γῆν*, and in ver. 14 *ὡς ἂν παραδῶ κύριος ἡμῖν τὴν πόλιν.* Clement's language looks very much like a combination of vv. 9, 14, which might well have been suggested by Origen. A very simple explanation of this matter may be offered. Let us suppose the writer of our epistle to have had the *Latin* version of Origen before him, or in his mind, and not the *Greek*. This Latin version of Rahab's words looks as though it might be an amalgamation of Josh. ii. 9 with ver. 14. Our writer, we shall suppose, wished Origen to be considered as bearing witness to his § 12. He therefore himself combined vers. 9, 14, and, having been thus induced to vary from the language of Josh. ii. in this particular sentence, preserved his consistency by giving no part of the conversation in § 12 in the language of Josh. ii.

Let us now look at the concluding words of § 12, bearing in mind the references made above to Justin, Irenæus, and Origen.

He tells us that the spies instructed Rahab to hang the scarlet line from her house, and that by so doing they made it plain *ὅτι διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου* (Justin) *λύτρωσις* (Irenæus) *ἔσται πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν* (Origen) *καὶ ἐλπίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν.* 'Ορᾶτε (Origen) *ἀγαπητοί, οὐ μόνον πίστις* (Irenæus) *ἀλλὰ προφητεία* (Origen) *ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ γέγονεν.* Nothing can well exceed the skill with which this sentence is drawn. It will be observed that Clement does not say in what respect Rahab showed the gift of prophecy. He gives no prominence to Origen's view, and yet he might be claimed as favouring it. We remark that Clement's words meet the views of Justin, Irenæus, and Origen, but they are then themselves exhausted. We have to consider whether the passage of Clement is not a little too cleverly drawn, and whether the conclusion—when

all four passages are brought together, and all considerations of authorship and date are put on one side—ought not to be that Clement's is the later account. It is beyond dispute very like the pithy sentences of *Diognetus*, which gather into themselves some distinct feature from each of half a dozen different parallels. If we adopt the conclusion that our Clement was the later writer, we shall find support for it in Justin, who speaks of the death of the first-born of the Egyptians. This explains how the language of Ex. ix. comes to be used in § 12, par. 9.

We shall continue to use the name of Clement for convenience sake; but we shall only mean by the name the person who wrote or compiled the epistles which are now ascribed to Clement of Rome.

APPENDIX B.

It will be necessary now to show that the 2d Epistle of Clement is of the same character as the 1st, and that we may fairly examine the two together as though they were by the same author, and formed but one writing in two parts.

Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 126, speaks of apocryphal quotations as P. 249. a distinct feature of the 2d Epistle, and in a less degree of the 1st. Accordingly citations of this character are found in both epistles. This is, of course, no proof of genuineness. Whether the remarks of Photius are really his or not, the presence of these citations is as necessary in our epistles as the queen's head upon the coin that claims to belong to the reign of Queen Victoria. The presence of this feature proves nothing, though the absence of it would be fatal. If examination should show that these quotations, or any one of them, are P. 137. not from some apocryphal source, but simply manufactures by the writer himself, then the very characteristic of Clement's Epistles, which Photius supplies, instead of supporting our epistles, will the more fatally condemn them.

In *Ep.* ii. 4 is found the following citation: εἶπεν ὁ κύριος. Ἐὰν ᾗτε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου, καὶ μὴ ποιῇτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν Ὑπάγετε ἀπ'

ἔμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ, ἐργάται ἀνομίας. In illustration of the imagery and language, Lightfoot refers to Isa. xl. 11; Prov. xxx. 4; S. Luke xiii. 27; and to Justin, *Apol.* i. 16, *Dial.* 76. He supposes it to be "taken from the gospel of the Egyptians," which is used (by the help of Clement of Alexandria) in *Ep.* ii. 12; and upon this use he founds a conjecture as to the country to which the writer of this 2d Epistle belonged. The inference is a just one if the citation before us be, what it clearly professes to be, the citation of a saying of our Lord out of some apocryphal source.

What is it, however?

Of the words which we have given, S. Luke xiii. 27 will supply ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ. In *Apol.* i. 16, Justin quotes this verse thus: καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας. To complete the latter part of the citation we only want ὑπάγετε. For this we go to *Dial.* 76. There Justin writes: καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἀναχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. Καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις οἷς καταδικάζειν τοὺς ἀναξίους μὴ σῶζεσθαι μέλλει, ἔφη ἐρεῖν· Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον κ.τ.λ. We thus get the ὑπάγετε; but it is not in the quotation with which we are dealing, but in another. It is difficult to suppose this to be accidental, and we naturally look for other indications that Clement's eye was upon Justin. In *Apol.* i. 16, S. Luke xiii. 27 is the fourth of several quotations strung together without any remarks of Justin's. S. Matt. vii. 21, 24, 22 precede. S. Matt. vii. 21 ("Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will (ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα) of my Father which is in heaven") is prefaced by ἀλλὰ τοὺς καὶ τὰ ἔργα πράττοντας, σωθήσονται ἔφη. Εἶπε γὰρ οὕτως· οὐχὶ πᾶς κ.τ.λ. Clement prefaces his quotation thus: διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἡμῶν πρᾶσσόντων, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος κ.τ.λ. He uses Justin's σωθήσονται in his version of part of S. Matt. vii. 21, which he gives in this same § 4, and which is this: Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι κύριε, κύριε, σωθήσεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην. The ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα, which Justin uses, Clement uses in the sentence following the quotation which we are discussing, where he says: ποιήσωμεν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς. The evidence, then, that Clement used Justin for the latter part of his quotation, is as strong as it can be, short of being such as would have exposed the fraud on the

first occasion of the comparison of the two writers. The expression, however, *ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην*, which Clement selects for his version of S. Matt. vii. 21, is worth a little attention. It is a recollection of 1 John ii. 29, as his words a few lines before (in § 3) sufficiently show. He writes: *τοσοῦτον οὖν ἔλεος ποιήσαντος αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες τοῖς νεκροῖς θεοῖς οὐ θύομεν καὶ οὐ προσκυνοῦμεν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐγνωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας. Τίς ἡ γνώσις τῆς ἀληθείας ἢ τὸ μὴ ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν δι' οὗ ἐγνωμεν αὐτόν;* For the latter part compare *ὅτι πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστι. Τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ψεύστης (ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, S. John viii. 44), εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς . . . πᾶς ὁ ἐρνούμενος τὸν Υἱὸν οὐδὲ τὸν Πατέρα ἔχει, 1 John ii. 21–23.* We shall hardly question the use of S. John's Epistle, or the way in which the expression *τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας* was suggested. It is too apt to be accidental. What kind, we may well ask, of work is this? Not surely the work of a man preparing a homily (such as *Ep.* ii. is supposed to be) for use in church? We shall ask the question with more astonishment if we observe that for the earlier part of the words now given from § 3, 1 Thess. iv. 15–17 was used. Compare *ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες . . . καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον· ἔπειτα κ.τ.λ.* This idea is confirmed by the Syriac version, which “translates” *ἀλλ' ἐγνωμεν* Pp. 24, 142,
154, 255,
257, 267. “as if it had read *ἔπειτα δὲ ὅτι*” (Light. *Add.* p. 451). Does any one suppose that half a dozen lines of honest Greek can be the victim of two sets of accidental coincidences, if they be accidental? If they are not accidental, will any one argue that the man who had had the Epistles of S. Paul and S. John in his hands, and made such careful use of them, could not have written the quotations from S. Matthew and S. Luke as they stand in the gospels, if he had been so disposed? We need not, however, be surprised. Lightfoot points out that § 1 of this epistle is coloured by the language, though not by the thought, of Heb. xii. 1. Stephens calls this kind of writing P. 14. “parody.”

Some further considerations will strengthen the position which we have taken up as to the use of Justin. In § 2, Clement quotes Isa. liv. 1, and writes: *ἐπεὶ ἔρημος ἐδόκει εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ λαὸς ἡμῶν, νυνὶ δὲ πιστεύσαντες πλείονες ἐγενό-
μεθα τῶν δοκούντων ἔχειν Θεόν. καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει, “Ὅτι*

οὐκ ἤλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς. This last text is quoted in *Just. Apol.* i. 15 (we were just now using § 16). The first text is quoted in *Apol.* i. 53. Justin says: ὡς δὲ προσφευτεύθη ὅτι πλείονες οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πιστεύοντες τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Σαμαρεῶν . . . ἔρημα γὰρ ἦν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ, χειρῶν ἔργοις λατρεύοντα. Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ καὶ Σαμαρεῖς, ἔχοντες τὸν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον . . . ἠγνόησαν. Clement's sentence looks very much as though it were made up out of Justin. Lightfoot gives the reference, but not the words of Justin.

Photius, *Bibl.* 126, when describing the Epistles of Clement, P. 249, says: οὐ μὴν οὐδ' ἀπαρακαλύπτως αὐτὸν οὐδαμῇ ἐν τούτοις βλασφημεῖ. In *Just. Dial.* 76 (used above), ἀπαρακαλύπτως, a word but rarely found, is used. The whole sentence, as applied to the celebrated Clement of Rome, seems strange. It is very emphatic, but perhaps may be thought to "protest too much," as though something of irony and satire lurked beneath the word ἀπαρακαλύπτως.

We are now in a position better to appreciate the force of the evidence, which we shall proceed to bring forward, as to the way in which the rest of the apocryphal citation given above was put together.

In chap. ii. we shall have occasion to refer to Eusebius, *Comment. in Ps.* (LXX.) lxxvi. 6, p. 891. A little above, in the same page, we observe ὁσάκις ἁμαρτήσαντας αὐτοὺς ἀποβαλὼν; cf. καὶ μὴ ποιῆτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλὼ ὑμᾶς of Clement's quotation. Eusebius is there commenting on LXX. Ps. lxxiii. 1, ἵνατί, ὁ Θεὸς, ἀπώσω εἰς τέλος, ὠργίσθη ὁ θυμὸς σου ἐπὶ πρόβατα νομῆς σου; If we refer to this psalm and to this verse of it, we find Eusebius, p. 854, quoting it, and saying, μεθ' ἣν καὶ εἰς τέλος ἀπεβλήθησαν. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ αὐτὸς παρίστη λέγων. Ὅσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησατε (S. Luke xiii. 35);—γενόμενα πρόβατα νομῆς αὐτοῦ. But ver. 11 we observe, runs: ἵνατί ἀποστρέφεις τὴν χειρὰ σου καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν σου ἐκ μέσου τοῦ κόλπου σου εἰς τέλος; Eusebius says: ὁ κόλπος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθῶν ἐστὶ πλήρης, διὸ λέλεκται. Μονογενὴς Υἱὸς ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. The suggestion is now made easy to Isa. xl. 11 "He shall gather the lambs with His arm, and carry them in His bosom."

The history of Clement's quotation may now be sufficiently

explained. In Eusebius' comment on Ps. lxxvi. we find a parallel for the central words of the quotation. That parallel is contained in a discussion of a verse from Ps. lxxiii. In Ps. lxxiii. this verse is again connected with ἀποβάλλειν and followed immediately by the quotation of S. Luke xiii. 35, which not only supplies a parallel to the first words of the quotation, but is in S. Luke only a little below the verse on which the closing words of the quotation are founded. For those closing words we have shown that Clement was indebted to Justin. Further on, in Ps. lxxiii., we find the hint for Clement's ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ. There is no room here, we must remember, for knowledge of Clement on the part of Justin and Eusebius. The things which we have pointed out must necessarily be accidental, or mean what we say they mean. It is worthy of remark that Eusebius' comment on Ps. lxxiii. was just as interesting to Stephens as to Clement. One example we will take from the comment on ver. 1, immediately above the quotation of S. Luke xiii. 35, where Eusebius says that the Jewish nation often fell into sin: εἴτ' ἐπιστρέφων αὐτοὺς ἀνελάμβανεν ὁ Θεός· . . . οὐδέποτε δὲ αὐτοὺς ἀπωθεῖτο εἰς τέλος. In his comment on ver. 19, he writes: μνήσθητι τῆς συνθήκης σου . . . καινὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῖς διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . ἀλλὰ σὺ μὴ . . . ἀποστραφῇς τὰς ἱκετηρίας. We remember also the ὁσάκις ἀμαρτήσαντας αὐτοὺς ἀποβαλὼν of the parallel passage in Ps. lxxvi. Stephens, in a prayer, *Rud. Fid.* p. 312, reminds God that the Israelites of old oftentimes provoked Him, and brought down upon themselves His chastisements: ἀλλ' ὅμως ὁσάκις μετανόησας ἐπέστρεψε πρὸς σε, τοσάκις τῶν σῶν ἔτυχον οἰκτιρμῶν . . . διὰ τὰς . . . συνθήκας . . . συμφορὰς ἀπέστρεψας, ὥστε σε τὰς αὐτῶν οὐδέποτε ἀπώσασθαι εὐχάς, going on to speak of the better covenant in Jesus Christ.

The foregoing argument may be materially strengthened by some further considerations. We see before us in Eusebius an easy suggestion of Isa. xl. 11 τῷ βραχίονι αὐτοῦ συνάξει ἄρνας καὶ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ βαστάσει. The latter clause, as Lightfoot points out, is only found in some inferior mss. of the LXX., though it is in the Hebrew original. Aquila and Symmachus give it. Aquila, however, reads ἄρνία instead of ἄρνας. In Clement's § 5 there is a return to the metaphor of the lambs, and ἄρνία is used: λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος, "Ἔσεσθε ὡς

ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. This might be suggested by Just. *Apol.* i. 16 (used above), ἔσωθεν δὲ ὄντες λύκοι ἄρπαγες (S. Matt. vii. 15), ἔξωθεν μὲν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων. Clement has in this § 5 another apocryphal quotation in hand, compounded of S. Luke x. 3 (or S. Mark x. 16), S. Matt. x. 28, S. Luke xii. 4, 5 ("Fear not them that kill the body," etc.). Lightfoot quotes these, and adds the saying as it is read in *Clem. Hom.* xvii. 4, and in Justin, *Apol.* i. 19. We shall now transcribe this second apocryphal citation as it stands in Clement, noting the coincidences with the various forms of the saying given in Lightfoot's note: "Μὴ φοβείσθωσαν" (the gospels) "τὰ ἀρνία" (Aquila) "τοὺς λύκους" (suggested by S. Matt. vii. 15) "μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν" (Justin) αὐτά. καὶ ὑμεῖς "μὴ φοβεῖσθε" (S. Matt.) "τοὺς ἀποκτένονοντας" (the gospels) ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν "δυναμένους ποιεῖν" (Justin and *Homily*), ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν "μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν" (Justin) ὑμᾶς "ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν" (S. Luke) "ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος" (order of S. Matt.), "τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός" (*Homily*; the order original). It cannot be denied that Clement's apocryphal quotations have every appearance of being his own careful manufacture.

We have one thing more to notice with respect to Clement's quotation given at the beginning of this section, and it will
P. 42. form a very suitable conclusion. "For the expression *συνάγειν ἐν κόλπῳ*, 'to gather in the lap,' " Lightfoot says, "see LXX. Prov. xxx. 4 (xxiv. 7)." The verse referred to runs: τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ κατέβη; τίς συνήγαγεν ἀνέμους ἐν κόλπῳ; τίς συνέστρεψεν ὕδωρ ἐν ἱματίῳ; τίς ἐκράτησε πάντων τῶν ἄκρων τῆς γῆς. The third⁷ of these clauses is parodied in *Evang. Thom.* B. x. p. 154, where our Lord, being sent to the well for water, and having broken the pitcher⁸ (*συνετρίβη ἡ ὕδρια αὐτοῦ*), is said to have taken off His garment (*ἐπενδύτην*) and filled it. The fourth clause is dealt with also in the *Evang. Thom.*, and on the same page. Joseph is there engaged in making a bed-

⁷ The first clause may be thought to be taken up in *Ep.* i. 28, where an extraordinary version is given of Ps. cxxxviii. 7-10, which we discuss at length in chap. ii.

⁸ From Eccles. xii. 6 (*συντριβὴ ὕδρια ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ*), as the *ἐν τῇ πηγῇ* in the same P. 42sq. line in *Evang. Thom.* B., the *ἐξήτησεν τοῦ εὐρεῖν* of ver. 10 used just below, the word *ἀνάστα* of Cant. ii. 10 exactly used just above, and various other small coincidences (*εἰλκυσαν*, *πλησίον*, κ.τ.λ.) sufficiently show. To the parallel passage in *Evang. Thom.* A. p. 144, we referred in note 2 of this chapter.

stead, and having found one of two pieces of wood too short for his purpose, is directed to place them side by side. The story goes: τότε κρατήσας καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸ ἕτερον ἄκρον εἴλκυσεν αὐτοῦ P. 63. τὴν ἄλλην προτομήν· ἐποίησεν καὶ κεῖνο ἴσον τοῦ ἄλλου ξύλου. It is from these fables and this page that the parallels are taken which are given in *Diognet.* xi. xii. The language of the first of these inventions is taken partly from Eccles. xii., the closing verses of which are parodied in *Orat.* i.⁹ In § 1 we have shown that these pages are connected with Clement's *Ep.* i. 12. Is it a rash conclusion that the second clause of the verse of the Book of Proverbs is taken up in Clement's 2d Epistle, and that this epistle is just as apocryphal as its companion the *Evang. Thom.*?

§ 2.

We shall endeavour to strengthen the conclusion at which we have just arrived, by referring to Hippolytus. Canon Lightfoot (*Addenda*, p. 470) gives some parallels out of Hippol. *Lib. adv. Græc.* to be compared with Clement's ii. 17, and says that "these resemblances suggest that our Clementine homily (*Ep.* ii.) was known to this writer." We may assume that a connection of some kind is acknowledged between Hippolytus P. 114. and Clement, and have only to consider on which side the obligation rests. Of the treatise to which Lightfoot refers we shall say only that it deals with the statements of Plato concerning a future state as these are set forth, in part at least, in *Axiochus*, which bears Plato's name; that we have given a parallel out of the very place to which Hippolytus may be thought to refer in *Diognet.* viii. 1, and that Hippolytus' τὸν τῶν πατέρων (δικαίων, *Sacr. Par.*) χῶρον would very naturally

⁹ Eccles. xii. ends: πολλὰ ἐξήτησιν ἐκκλησιαστὴς τοῦ εὐρεῖν λόγους θελήματος . . . οἱ παρὰ τῶν συνθέματων ἐδόθησαν ἐκ ποιμένος ἑνος.—τέλος λόγου, τὸ πᾶν ἄκουε. τὸν Θεὸν φοβοῦ, καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ φύλασσε, ὅτι τοῦτο πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος. ὅτι σύμπαν τὸ ποίημα ὁ Θεὸς ἄξει ἐν κρίσει κ.τ.λ. Comp. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς εἶδρον ὅσιον ἢ θεοφιλές· αὐτὰ γὰρ τὰ τῶν ποιητῶν ὑμῶν συνθέματα λύσσης καὶ ἀκρασίας ἐστι μνημεῖα.—ἀπὸ λεπτοῦ ποιμένος Pp. 175, . . . περὶ τῶν ὅπλων κρίσιν . . . ἵνα τοῖς Ὀμήρου μύθοις πείθωμαι· ἔστι γὰρ ἡ πᾶσα 191. ῥαψωδία, Ἰλιάδος τε καὶ Ὀδυσσεύς ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, γυνή, *Orat.* 1. Note the double meaning of which ποίημα is capable, the pointed opposition of γυνή to ἄνθρωπος, that σύνθημα (not σύνθεμα) is used in *Orat.* 5. For the expression ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, see *Evang. Thom.* A. vii. 141. See preceding note.

suggest τὸν τῶν εὐσεβῶν χῶρον of *Axioch.* p. 371, and which is used in *Ep.* i. 50. As so often Clement might be thought to have combined both passages in his own words. Hippolytus writes: ἀλλὰ καὶ οὐ τὸν τῶν πατέρων χῶρον καὶ τοὺς δικαίους ὁρᾶσι, p. 798. In *Axioch.* p. 371, we have ὅσοις μὲν οὖν ἐν τῷ ζῆν δαίμων ἀγαθὸς ἐπέπνευσεν, εἰς τὸν τῶν εὐσεβῶν χῶρον οἰκίζονται. Clement says: ἀλλ' οἱ ἐν ἀγάπῃ τελειωθέντες κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν ἔχουσιν χῶρον εὐσεβῶν οἱ φανερωθήσονται ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. 50.

In *Contr. Noet.* xvi. p. 825, Hippolytus writes: ἀλλ' ἢ Πνεῦμα τουτέστιν ὁ Λόγος; ἀλλ' ἐρεῖς μοι. Πῶς γεγέννηται; Τὴν μὲν κατὰ σὲ διήγησιν, ὡς ἐγέννησαι, οὐ δύνῃ ἐξειπεῖν, καίτοι τῆς ἐκάστης ἡμέρας ὁρῶν τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αἰτίαν, καὶ τὴν περὶ τοῦτον οἰκονομίαν ἀκριβῶς ἐξειπεῖν οὐ δύνασαι. Compare ὁ τοιοῦτος οὖν οὐ μεταλήψεται τοῦ πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, and (omitting two lines) οὔτε ἐξειπεῖν τις δύναται οὔτε λαλῆσαι κ.τ.λ., *Ep.* ii. 14. We remark, however, that Theophilus begins *Autol.* ii. 12 by saying: τῆς μὲν οὖν Ἐξαήμερου οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων δυνατὸς κατ' ἀξίαν τὴν ἐξήγησιν (διήγησιν, just below) καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν πᾶσαν ἐξειπεῖν . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰ μυρίοις ἔτεσι βίωσει τις . . . οὐδὲ οὕτως ἔσται ἱκανὸς πρὸς ταῦτα ἀξίως τι εἰπεῖν κ.τ.λ. If to this we add, *Ep.* i. 49 τίς δύναται ἐξηγήσασθαι; τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς καλλωνῆς αὐτοῦ τίς ἀρετὸς ἐξειπεῖν; and, after a few lines, in § 50 οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξήγησις· τίς ἱκανὸς ἐν αὐτῇ εὐρεθῆναι κ.τ.λ., we have as pretty a piece of literary entanglement as can be desired. It is made the more interesting by observing that the passage in Theophilus is the preface to the parallel which we have given to *Diognet.* viii.; that the words now given from *Ep.* i. 50 are only two or three lines above the passage which we just now saw might have been in part taken from Hippolytus, and in part from *Axiochus*; and that the parallel for *Diognetus* from *Axiochus* was also for § viii. 1. We remark, further, that a connection between Theophilus and Clement's *Ep.* i. is not doubtful, since Lightfoot, in dealing with *Ep.* i. 23, refers to "the parallel passage" in *Autol.* i. 13.

Looking now at the passages which we have brought together, if we suppose Clement's to be of the earlier date, we must further suppose that Hippolytus, with one eye upon Clement's *Ep.* ii., had the other fixed upon Theophilus in a passage where he has Clement's *Ep.* i. in his mind. Does it

not seem a simpler view, to suppose Clement to be the later writer? That he used Hippolytus in one passage and Theophilus in the other? That Hippolytus had some knowledge of Theophilus, and that Theophilus was the independent writer? It is of course perfectly useless to argue the question as it stands. We must look for further evidence, which is, however, close at hand. Theophilus, in the place referred to, as also in *Autol.* iii. 1, uses the word *ματαιοπονία*, which is not at all of common use. Lucian in his *Dial. Mort.* uses it; and from the place where he does so use it we took the parallel which we have given to *Diognet.* viii. 4. To *Diognet.* viii. 2, observe, we have given the passage itself from Theophilus, which contains the word, as a parallel. Turning to Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* x. 8, we find that he brings a philosopher upon the scene, and that, after a few lines in which the parallel for *Diognetus* just referred to is found, he makes Mercury say: *κατάθου σὺ τὸ σχῆμα πρῶτον . . . ὅσῃν μὲν τὴν ἀλαζονείαν κομίζεις . . . καὶ ἔριν καὶ κενοδοξίαν . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ματαιοπονίαν μάλα πολλήν, καὶ λῆρον (Diognet. viii. 2) οὐκ ὀλίγον . . . καὶ ἡδυπαθείαν δὲ . . . καὶ ὀργήν, καὶ τρυφήν . . . καὶ τὸ ψεῦδος δὲ ἀπόθου, καὶ τὸν τύφον, καὶ τὸ οἶσθαι ἀμείνων εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων, and presently ἀποθέμενος. Cf. ἀπολιπόντες τὴν ματαιοπονίαν τὴν τε ἔριν καὶ τὸ εἰς θάνατον ἄγον ζῆλος, and, after one line, λάβωμεν Ἐνώχ, ὃς ἐν ὑπακοῇ δίκαιος εὐρεθεὶς μετετέθη, *Er.* i. 9; ὑπήκοον γενέσθαι, *Er.* i. 10; and also ταπεινοφρονήσωμεν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ἀλαζονείαν καὶ τύφος καὶ ἀφροσύνην καὶ ὀργάς, *Er.* i. 13. Any one may observe from time to time in Lucian what appear to be recollections of the N. T. In the passage just quoted there are obvious resemblances to Phil. ii. 3 *μηδὲν κατὰ ἐρίθειαν ἢ κενοδοξίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν*; and, ver. 8 *καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἔταπεινάσεν ἑαυτόν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου*. Observe how these two verses fill in the passages just given out of Clement. Taking all the circumstances of the case into consideration, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Lucian was used by Clement, and that he must necessarily therefore have copied from Theophilus, and probably from Hippolytus.*

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

In Twenty-four Handsome 8vo Volumes, Subscription Price £6, 6s. od.,

Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

A COLLECTION OF ALL THE WORKS OF THE FATHERS OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA.

EDITED BY THE

REV. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D., AND JAMES DONALDSON, LL.D.

MESSRS. CLARK are now happy to announce the completion of this Series. It has been received with marked approval by all sections of the Christian Church in this country and in the United States, as supplying what has long been felt to be a want, and also on account of the impartiality, learning, and care with which Editors and Translators have executed a very difficult task.

The Publishers do not bind themselves to *continue* to supply the Series at the Subscription price.

The Works are arranged as follow :—

FIRST YEAR.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS, comprising Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians; Polycarp to the Ephesians; Martyrdom of Polycarp; Epistle of Barnabas; Epistles of Ignatius (longer and shorter, and also the Syriac version); Martyrdom of Ignatius; Epistle to Diognetus; Pastor of Hermas; Papias; Spurious Epistles of Ignatius. In One Volume.
JUSTIN MARTYR; ATHENAGORAS. In One Volume.
TATIAN; THEOPHILUS; THE CLEMENTINE Recognitions. In One Volume.
CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Volume First, comprising Exhortation to Heathen; The Instructor; and a portion of the Miscellanies.

SECOND YEAR.

HIPPOLYTUS, Volume First; Refutation of all Heresies, and Fragments from his Commentaries.
IRENÆUS, Volume First.
TERTULLIAN AGAINST MARCION.
CYPRIAN, Volume First; the Epistles, and some of the Treatises.

THIRD YEAR.

IRENÆUS (completion); HIPPOLYTUS (completion); Fragments of Third Century. In One Volume.
ORIGEN: De Principiis; Letters; and portion of Treatise against Celsus.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Volume Second; Completion of Miscellanies.
TERTULLIAN, Volume First; To the Martyrs; Apology; To the Nations, etc.

FOURTH YEAR.

CYPRIAN, Volume Second (completion); Novatian; Minucius Felix; Fragments.
METHODIUS; ALEXANDER OF LYCOPOLIS; PETER OF ALEXANDRIA; ANATOLIUS; Clement on Virginity; and Fragments.
TERTULLIAN, Volume Second.
APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, ACTS, AND Revelations; comprising all the very curious Apocryphal Writings of the first three Centuries.

FIFTH YEAR.

TERTULLIAN, Volume Third (completion).
CLEMENTINE HOMILIES; APOSTOLICAL Constitutions. In One Volume.
ARNOBIUS.
DIONYSIUS; GREGORY THAUMATURGUS; Syrian Fragments. In One Volume.

SIXTH YEAR.

LACTANTIUS; Two Volumes.
ORIGEN, Volume Second (completion). 12s. to Non-Subscribers.
EARLY LITURGIES AND REMAINING Fragments. 9s. to Non-Subscribers.

Single Years cannot be had separately, unless to complete sets; but any Volume may be had separately, price 10s. 6d.,—with the exception of ORIGEN, Vol. II., 12s.; and the EARLY LITURGIES, 9s.

*Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,***HIPPOLYTUS AND CALLISTUS;**

OR,

**THE CHURCH OF ROME IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE
THIRD CENTURY.**

BY J. J. IGN. VON DÖLLINGER.

Translated, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices,

BY ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A.,

MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

'That this learned and laborious work is a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history, is a fact of which we need hardly assure our readers. The name of the writer is a sufficient guarantee of this. It bears in all its pages the mark of that acuteness which, even more than the unwearied industry of its venerated Author, is a distinguishing feature of whatever proceeds from the pen of Dr. Döllinger.'—*John Bull*.

*Just published, in Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 12s. each,***A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH
To A.D. 429.***From the Original Documents.*

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

C. J. HEFELE, D.D., BISHOP OF ROTTENBURG.

'This careful translation of Hefele's Councils.'—Dr. PUSEY.

'A thorough and fair compendium, put in the most accessible and intelligent form.'—*Guardian*.'A work of profound erudition, and written in a most candid spirit. The book will be a standard work on the subject.'—*Spectator*.

'The most learned historian of the Councils.'—Père GRATRY.

'We cordially commend Hefele's Councils to the English student.'—*John Bull*.*In demy 8vo, 700 pages, price 12s.,***A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY
ON THE
BOOK OF PSALMS.**

WITH A NEW TRANSLATION.

BY JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D., T.C.D.,

AUTHOR OF COMMENTARIES ON THE BOOKS OF GENESIS, EXODUS, ETC.

'This work aims, and not unsuccessfully, at bringing out the sense and elucidating the principle of each psalm. The notes are plain and to the purpose. It has plenty of matter, and is not diffuse.'—*Guardian*.

'Dr. Murphy's contribution to the literature of the Psalms is a most welcome addition. . . . We have no hesitation in predicting for it a cordial reception from all who can appreciate a sound and scholarly exegesis, and who are anxious to discover the full and exact meaning of the inspired word.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

SERMONS
FOR THE
CHRISTIAN YEAR.
ADVENT—TRINITY.

BY PROFESSOR ROTHE.

TRANSLATED BY WILLIAM R. CLARK, M.A. OXON.,
Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Taunton.

‘The volume is rich in noble thoughts and wholesome lessons.’—*Watchman*.

‘The sermons before us are wonderfully simple in construction and expression, and at the same time remarkably fresh and suggestive. . . . It is a mind of real keenness, singularly pure and gentle, and of lofty spirituality, that expresses itself in these discourses.’—*Weekly Review*.

Just published, in two vols., large crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d. each,

THE YEAR OF SALVATION.
WORDS OF LIFE FOR EVERY DAY.
A BOOK OF HOUSEHOLD DEVOTION.
BY J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D.

‘A work of great value and interest. To the clergy these readings will be found full of suggestive hints for sermons and lectures; while for family reading or for private meditation they are most excellent. The whole tone of the work is thoroughly practical, and never becomes controversial.’—*Church Bells*.

‘The *very best* religious exposition for everyday use that has ever fallen in our way.’—*Bell's Weekly Messenger*.

‘This charming and practical book of household devotion will be welcomed on account of its rare intrinsic value, as one of the most practical devotional books ever published.’—*Standard*.

‘Massive of thought, persuasive, earnest, and eloquent.’—*Literary Churchman*.

‘As might have been expected from so clear and vigorous a thinker, every passage is valuable either as an exposition or a suggestion.’—HENRY WARD BEECHER in *Christian Union*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

MOSES:
A BIBLICAL STUDY.

‘Our author has seized, as with the instinct of a master, the great salient points in the life and work of Moses, and portrayed the various elements of his character with vividness and skill. . . . The work will at once take its place among our ablest and most valuable expository and practical discourses.’—*Baptist Magazine*.

‘A volume full of valuable and suggestive thought, which well deserves and will amply repay careful perusal. We have read it with real pleasure.’—*Christian Observer*.

DR. LUTHARDT'S WORKS.

In three handsome crown 8vo volumes, price 6s. each.

'We do not know any volumes so suitable in these times for young men entering on life, or, let us say, even for the library of a pastor called to deal with such, than the three volumes of this series. We commend the whole of them with the utmost cordial satisfaction. They are altogether quite a specialty in our literature.'—*Weekly Review*.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Fourth Edition.

By C. E. LUTHARDT, D.D., LEIPZIG.

'From Dr. Luthardt's exposition even the most learned theologians may derive invaluable criticism, and the most acute disputants supply themselves with more trenchant and polished weapons than they have as yet been possessed of.'—*Bell's Weekly Messenger*.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE SAVING TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Third Edition.

'Dr. Luthardt is a profound scholar, but a very simple teacher, and expresses himself on the gravest matters with the utmost simplicity, clearness, and force.'—*Literary World*.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE MORAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Second Edition.

'The ground covered by this work is, of course, of considerable extent, and there is scarcely any topic of specifically moral interest now under debate in which the reader will not find some suggestive saying. The volume contains, like its predecessors, a truly wealthy apparatus of notes and illustrations.'—*English Churchman*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

By PROFESSOR C. E. LUTHARDT,
Author of 'Fundamental Truths of Christianity,' etc.

Translated and the Literature enlarged by C. R. GREGORY, Leipzig.

'A work of thoroughness and value. The translator has added a lengthy Appendix, containing a very complete account of the literature bearing on the controversy respecting this Gospel. The indices which close the volume are well ordered, and add greatly to its value.'—*Guardian*.

'There are few works in the later theological literature which contain such a wealth of sober theological knowledge and such an invulnerable phalanx of objective apologetical criticism.'—*Professor Guericke*.

Crown 8vo, 5s.,

LUTHARDT, KAHNIS, AND BRÜCKNER.

The Church: Its Origin, its History, and its Present Position.

'A comprehensive review of this sort, done by able hands, is both instructive and suggestive.'—*Record*.

Just published, in One Volume, 8vo, price 12s.,

Final Causes.

By PAUL JANET, Member of the Institute, Paris.

Translated from the French by William Affleck, B.D.

CONTENTS.

PRELIMINARY CHAPTER—The Problem. BOOK I.—The Law of Finality. CHAPTER I. The Principle.—II. The Facts.—III. The Industry of Man and the Industry of Nature.—IV. Organ and Function.—V. Mechanism and Finality.—VI. Objections and Difficulties.—VII. The Doctrine of Evolution. BOOK II.—The First Cause of Finality. CHAPTER I. The Physico-Theological Argument.—II. Subjective and Immanent Finality.—III. Finality and Intention.—IV. Pure Idea and Creative Activity.—V. The Supreme End of Nature. APPENDIX.—I. The Problem of Induction.—II. Cuvier's Law.—III. Lesage, of Geneva, and Final Causes.—IV. Geoffroy Saint Hilaire and the Doctrine of Final Causes.—V. Final Causes in the Sankhya Philosophy.—VI. Optimism—Voltaire and Rousseau.

This work of Janet on the *Causes Finales* is really an event in science, and ought to have a large circulation among the educated classes.

In One Volume, 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

The Doctrine of the Apocalypse,

And its Relation to the Doctrine of the Gospel and Epistles of John.

By HERMANN GEBHARDT.

'A contribution of decided value to the doctrinal and spiritual exposition of the mystic volume, and in this respect worthy of careful study.'—*Church Bells*.

'The Author has instituted and carried out a thorough and exhaustive examination of the Book of Revelation; . . . he has subjected the whole text of that highly symbolic, and, to ordinary readers, mysterious and incomprehensible book, to a minute and searching scrutiny.'—*Scotsman*.

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s.,

Growth of the Spirit of Christianity,

FROM THE FIRST CENTURY TO THE DAWN OF
THE LUTHERAN ERA.

BY THE

REV. GEORGE MATHESON, M.A., B.D.,

AUTHOR OF 'AIDS TO THE STUDY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.'

'Mr. Matheson's work is fresh, vigorous, learned, and eminently thoughtful.'—*Contemporary Review*.

'This work is a contribution of real value to the popular study of Church History.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

'These volumes are the work of a very able and pious and cultured thinker.'—*Church Quarterly Review*.

In crown 8vo, Third Edition, price 4s. 6d.,

Aids to the Study of German Theology.

'The Author has done his work well, and has given us a real help to the understanding of German theology.'—*Princeton Review*.

'A work of much labour and learning, giving in a small compass an intelligent review of a very large subject.'—*Spectator*.

'The writer or compiler deserves high praise for the clear manner in which he has in a brief compass stated these opinions.'—*Christian Observer*.

In crown 8vo, Eighth Edition, price 7s. 6d.,

THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR; OR, MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST DAYS OF THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

By F. W. KRUMMACHER, D.D.

'The work bears throughout the stamp of an enlightened intellect, under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, and of a profound study of the word of God.'—*Record*.

'The reflections are of a pointed and practical character, and are eminently calculated to inform the mind and improve the heart. To the devout and earnest Christian the volume will be a treasure indeed.'—*Wesleyan Times*.

'The work will be prized by experienced Christians throughout the world; and is destined, we trust, to as wide a circulation and as long a life as the gifted Author's "Elijah."'—*English Presbyterian Messenger*.

'Having already spoken of it in terms the most cordial and admiring, we have only to repeat our testimony to its peculiar excellence.'—*Church of England Magazine*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, Second Edition, in crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

DAVID, THE KING OF ISRAEL: A PORTRAIT DRAWN FROM BIBLE HISTORY AND THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

'Dr. Krummacher's work on David's life resembles that of his "Elijah" in its eloquence, its graphic description, its devout and earnest spirit, and will be widely welcomed.'—*Evangelical Magazine*.

At the close of two articles reviewing this work, the *Christian Observer* says: 'Our space will not permit us to consider more at large this very interesting work, but we cannot do less than cordially commend it to the attention of our readers. It affords such an insight into King David's character as is nowhere else to be met with; it is therefore most instructive.'

'A pleasant household reading-book for many people.'—*Literary Churchman*.

In demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

SERMONS TO THE NATURAL MAN.

By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D.,

Author of 'A History of Christian Doctrine,' etc.

'These sermons are admirably suited to their purpose. Characterized by profound knowledge of divine truth, and presenting the truth in a chaste and attractive style, the sermons carry in their tone the accents of the solemn feeling of responsibility to which they owe their origin.'—*Weekly Review*.

In One Volume, crown 8vo, price 5s., Third Edition,

LIGHT FROM THE CROSS: SERMONS ON THE PASSION OF OUR LORD.

Translated from the German of A. THOLUCK, D.D.,

Professor of Theology in the University of Halle.

'With no ordinary confidence and pleasure, we commend these most noble, solemnizing and touching discourses.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

In Three Volumes, 8vo, price 31s. 6d.,

A COMMENTARY
ON THE
GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

BY F. GODET, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHÂTEL.

‘This work forms one of the battle-fields of modern inquiry, and is itself so rich in spiritual truth that it is impossible to examine it too closely; and we welcome this treatise from the pen of Dr. Godet. We have no more competent exegete, and this new volume shows all the learning and vivacity for which the author is distinguished.’—*Freeman*.

Just published, in Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

A COMMENTARY
ON THE
GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

BY F. GODET,
DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHÂTEL.

Translated from the Second French Edition.

‘We are indebted to the Publishers for an English translation of the admirable work which stands at the head of this review. . . . It is a work of great ability, learning, and research.’—*Christian Observer*.

‘Marked by clearness and good sense, it will be found to possess value and interest as one of the most recent and copious works specially designed to illustrate this Gospel.’—*Guardian*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, Third Edition, price 10s. 6d.,

MODERN DOUBT & CHRISTIAN BELIEF.

A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest
Seekers after Truth.

BY THEODORE CHRISTLIEB, D.D.,
UNIVERSITY PREACHER AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT BONN.

Translated, with the Author's sanction, chiefly by the Rev. H. U. WEITBRECHT, Ph.D., and Edited by the Rev. T. L. KINGSBURY, M.A., Vicar of Easton Royal, and Rural Dean.

‘We recommend the volume as one of the most valuable and important among recent contributions to our apologetic literature. . . . We are heartily thankful both to the learned Author and to his translators.’—*Guardian*.

‘All the fundamental questions connected with revealed religion are handled more or less fully. The volume shows throughout intellectual force and earnestness.’—*Athenæum*.

‘We express our unfeigned admiration of the ability displayed in this work, and of the spirit of deep piety which pervades it; and whilst we commend it to the careful perusal of our readers, we heartily rejoice that in those days of reproach and blasphemy, so able a champion has come forward to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.’—*Christian Observer*.

'This series is one of great importance to the biblical scholar; and as regards its general execution it leaves little or nothing to be desired.'—*Edinburgh Review*.

KEIL AND DELITZSCH'S COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In 25 Volumes, demy 8vo.

MESSRS. CLARK have resolved to offer complete sets of this work at the Original Subscription Price of £6, 11s. 6d. Single volumes may be had, price 10s. 6d.

Just published, in demy 4to, Second Edition, price 25s.,

BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

By HERMANN CREMER, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GREIFSWALD.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF THE SECOND EDITION
(WITH ADDITIONAL MATTER AND CORRECTIONS BY THE AUTHOR)

By WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.

'If the reader will search here for that which the Author professes to provide for him, he will, we think, never be disappointed. On the contrary, he will feel that Professor Cremer has placed him under deep obligation, and will have veins of rich and beautiful thought continually revealed.'—*British Quarterly Review*.

'We venture to express our conviction that the student will derive from it information which he will in vain seek in any other work of the same description.'—*Christian Observer*.

Just published, in One large 8vo Volume, Eighth English Edition, price 15s.,

A TREATISE ON THE GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK,

Regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis.

Translated from the German [of Dr. G. B. WINER].

With large additions and full Indices. Second Edition. Edited by Rev. W. F. MOULTON, D.D., one of the New Testament Translation Revisers.

'We gladly welcome the appearance of Winer's great work in an English translation, and must strongly recommend it to all who wish to attain to a sound and accurate knowledge of the language of the New Testament. We need not say it is *the* Grammar of the New Testament. It is not only superior to all others, but so superior as to be by common consent the one work of reference on the subject. No other could be mentioned with it.'—*Literary Churchman*.

470

1238746

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 072861310